DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 304 AA 000 700

AUTHOR	Adams, Raymond S.; And Others
TITLE	Social Work and the Training of Teachers of the Disadvantaged: A Final Report - Part V.
INSTITUTION	Missouri Univ., Columbia. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.
PUB DATE	71
GRANT	OEG-0-9-354719-1712-725
NOTE	193p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Abstracts, *Consortia, *Disadvantaged Youth, Models, *Social Work, *Teacher Education, Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Training Teacher Trainers Project, University of Missouri

ABSTRACT

The potential relevance of social work in the development of a teacher training program for teachers of disadvantaged children is investigated. Outcomes of the investigation are presented in the following discussions: (1) the deliberations of a Social Work consortium; (2) a condensed version of the material abstracted in the literature search; (3) a conceptual mapping of the field, accompanied by brief listings of relevant facts; and (4) a final summation. The information contained in the abstracts is grouped according to content under the following headings: The Family Unit; Negativism Toward the Poor; Impact on Poverty; Behavioral Characteristics of the Poor; Inferred Psychological Characteristics of the Poor; Characteristics of Thought Processes and Verbal Skills of the Poor; The Disadvantaged Negro and Other Minority Groups; Education and the Disadvantaged; and Recommendations for Education of the Disadvantaged. The summation discusses education-social work similarities and differences, an extrapolation from social work to education, teacher expectations, and the teacher in the organization. For related documents, see ED 050 300-303 and ED 050 305-306. (CK)

ED 050 304

SOCIAL WORK AND THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED

A FINAL REPORT

PART V

Contract
No. OEG-0-9-354719-1712-725
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

by

RAYMOND S. ADAMS
SUSAN SANDERS, SUSAN JAMESON
AND SALLY LEAREY

College of Education
University of Missouri
Columbia
1971

AA 000 700

1

PREFACE

This is the third of a series of reports concerned with the teaching of disadvantaged children. They are the direct outcome of the proposal funded as part of the U.S. Office of Education's T.T.T. Project. The initial proposal was presented under the names of Samuel R. Keys, Raymond S. Adams and William D. Hedges as co-project directors and Bob G. Woods as Dean of the College of Education. Prior to the writing of the proposal, a planning committee after deliberating over general priorities agreed on the focus that was adopted in the present undertaking. That committee comprised: Robert R. Wheeler, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, Mo., William D. Hedges, (then) Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Clayton, Mo., (now) Chairman of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Missouri at Columbia, and also from the University of Missouri at Columbia, Samuel R. Keys, Associate Dean of the College of Education, W. Francis English, Dean of Arts and Science, Donald O. Cowgill, Professor of Sociology, Ralf C. Bedell, Professor of Education, and Raymond S. Adams, Associate Professor of Social Research, Education and Sociology.

This present report confines its attention to the potential relevance of social work in the development of a teacher training program. It represents only one section of the initial phase of what was planned as a multi-phase project. In order to set the present report in perspective it is useful to outline the rationale that lies behind the whole scheme.

We started initially depressed and impressed by the fact that for the disadvantaged child, the consequences of disadvantage are a deprived and unhappy past, a drab and unpromising present and a future beset with hopelessness. We recognized that if education were to combat the deprivations of disadvantage, it would have to undergo substantial reform and improvement. However, whatever the nature of this reform and improvement might be, it would be of no use if the teachers of disadvantaged children remained incompetent to deal with their unique educational problem. For this reason, we felt that the most immediate task was to go about training teachers who could operate

successfully with disadvantaged children--irrespective of the extent to which school systems had undergone organisational and economic reform themselves.

We were led by our emphasis on teaching to focus initially on the teacher-pupil transaction. In the most down-to-earth terms, the educational process requires the teacher to act as an intermediary between the child and the subject matter of the curriculum. As an intermediary, the teacher translates subject matter into forms appropriate for the level of conceptual development of the child. How efficient the teacher is then, depends on (a) her subject matter competency, (b) her ability to understand the child's conceptual state, and (c) her ability to mediate between the two. It has been clearly demonstrated (Coleman, 1968) that teachers have failed spectacularly as mediators for the disadvantaged child. Available evidence suggests that this failure stems not from ignorance of subject matter but rather from a lack of understanding of how the disadvantaged child thinks, how he feels and how he 'sees' the world around him.

While the problem may be stated in relatively simple terms, solutions cannot be. What we have here, is an 'understanding-gap' that separates the teacher from the taught--the ghetto dweller from the mainstream of American life. And this is a culture gap--sometimes as wide if not wider than the gap between American culture and say Japanese. The illustration may be overly dramatic, but the ingredients are the same. The two cultures, ghetto and non-ghetto, are grossly ignorant of each others ways of life. Egocentrically and ethnocentrically, they perceive their own virtues and the other's vices; seldom seeing their own vices and the other's virtues. Because the two cultures have long been separated, their respective inhabitants have seldom felt constrained to examine their intercultural relationships. Now with protest and discontent burgeoning, and intercultural 'incidents' increasing, we have become aware of the need to pay attention to the social problem in our midst. What we see does not enchant. We have, in the case of the disadvantaged it seems, tangible evidence that violates the American dream.

But merely to identify the problem and become intensely concerned, is not to solve it. Solution depends on overcoming the inertia of

history--the social conditions that led to the extremes of poverty and disadvantage. They are, though we may be unwilling to admit it, still with us to a considerable degree. We have eliminated the practices of slavery but the attitudes that made it socially acceptable in the first place, have only undergone slight evolutions. Attitudes towards ethnic minorities and the economically unsuccessful, still reflect older beliefs in the social, moral and intellectual inadequacy of those who can be so classified. Given the irrationality of such attitudes and beliefs, and given their dysfunctional social consequences, reform is patently necessary. But the task is obviously a mammoth one. It will not be accomplished by haphazard, piece-meal attacks on selected problems here and there. Nor will it be accomplished immediately. We can anticipate that efforts at amelioration will intensify over the years, in range, in scope and in focus. One focus, and we think a critically important one, will be education. However, education has not yet served the disadvantaged community well. It too is bowed down by its own inertia. Consequently, if education is to change, it too will have to do more than make minor modifications to its venerable structure.

Because we believed that educational change in the training of teachers of disadvantaged children would need to be substantial, we envisaged (i) the development of a comprehensive and integrated 'system' (in the systems theory sense of the word) for training teachers of the underprivileged so that they become experts in understanding the world of the disadvantaged; (ii) the implementation of that system as both pre-service and in-service teacher training programs, and most importantly, (iii) the utilization of this system in-action as a training program for the trainers of teachers of the disadvantaged.

However, another assumption underlay our initial planning. We did not necessarily believe that all change must necessarily be for the better. We were convinced that some needless expenditure of money and effort could be avoided by careful and systematic planning. We also believed that careful and systematic planning would be facilitated if advantage were taken of whatever up-to-date knowledge relevant to the problem could be gathered, evaluated and used. Because we thought that a substantial amount of the knowledge available in the social sciences about the world of the disadvantaged child would be relevant,

we argued that it should therefore be accumulated, distilled and, when approved, be incorporated into our new system for training teachers.

While in accordance with the Triple T requirements, our principal objective was to provide a training program that would be viable for preparing trainers of teachers of the underprivileged, we held that such viability cannot be demonstrated unless competent teachers are being produced. Thus, hand in hand with the main objective went a correlative one of developing a program for the actual training of teachers. This program for teachers of underprivileged children then would serve two purposes: (1) to provide concrete evidence of the practical results of the system, (2) to provide a continuing source of evaluation of and feedback to the main programs.

It should be emphasized at the outset that the training of teachers involves more than the trainers themselves. It involves curricula, equipment, plant, and, in fact, all the paraphernalia of the entire teaching program. Consequently, any improvement in any of these is, in effect, an improvement of the trainer. The project provided not only for improvement in the training of the trainers, but also improvement in teaching aids and curricula as well. Further, it provided for improvement in the quality of supplementary training given by school administrators and supervisory teachers. Finally, in order to follow through, it provided for the development of a completely new trainer-training program per se.

The program can best be seen as a series of interrelated Tasks. These Tasks cluster for form four major Operations. These Operations are respectively: (1) research and development; (2) activation, (3) dissemination; and (4) application. Operation 1 represents the 'planning stage', Operation 2 represents the 'pilot stage', and Operations 3 and 4 represent the 'operating stage'. The present report is concerned only with one aspect of Operation 1. As such it is consistent with the other aspects of Operation 1. They all employ the same strategy. It is different from the others in that its focus is on community development.

Rationale. Educational action should be based on scientifically gleaned information. Regrettably, there is no empirical evidence available that adequately specifies the consequences of any program

for the disadvantaged. Educators cannot say with assurance 'if you do so and so with disadvantaged children, then such and such will result'. The best available information at the moment consists of teachers' 'good ideas'--the assembled 'folk wisdom' of the past. Regrettably the worst available information also comes from the same source. This folk wisdom as we have seen, has been grossly inadequate in meeting the needs of the disadvantaged child. This is partly because there is no a priori basis for distinguishing between the best and the worst, and partly because no attempts have been made to accumulate, integrate and organize the insights and understandings that expert practitioners have. However, other social sciences have been concerned with the underprivileged for some time. They have evidence and insights that could be valuable if adapted to educational purposes. Given the criticism of current educational practice, it seems wise at this point in time, to take advantage of any scientifically derived evidence not matter its origin, provided that in the judgement of educationists, it is seen as potentially useful.

The problem that initially confronted us then was to select among the different social science areas available. The relevancy of psychology and sociology were, we thought, both self-evident. So was that area of educational research devoted specifically to the disadvantaged. It also seemed to us, given the central part that language plays in education, that linguistics should provide us with another. Given also the school as an agency contributing to, and influenced by societal change, the inclusion of community development seemed warranted. However, there was also one applied social science whose record of concern for the disadvantaged was long and meritorious--social work. For this reason we chose to place it under examination also.

To the resulting six social science areas we added a seventh that could not be strictly classified as scientific. We felt that practical experience should not be completely disregarded. We knew that teachers had insights and understandings that were invaluable. The fact that they were not necessarily well documented in the literature or well integrated in the way that an academic theoretician might systematise his understandings, was not a sufficient deterrent to

prevent our attempting to probe this area too.

Our intention then was to attempt to establish a bridge between education and each of these areas. To mix the metaphor we wished to beging a process of translation into educationally useful terms of what might otherwise be regarded as exotic and esoteric information exclusively the property of the social sciences.

Our strategy in approaching each of the areas was the same in each case. It was twofold. First, we were to assemble a group of five acknowledged leaders in the field and confront them with the question: 'Given what insights you have into your area and knowledge you have about it, what do you consider the teacher of disadvantaged children needs to know, think, feel and understand'. In the discussion that ensued, the task of the moderator (an educationist) was to confine attention to this single-minded question and to probe the implications of the point raised. Initial experimentation led us to conclude that an all day session (with suitable breaks) provided optimal returns. The discussion was tape-recorded and the resulting transcript then provided a permanent record of currently salient ideas. The second strategy entailed an extensive search of contemporary literature. This was to be undertaken by graduate students in the specific areas. Their knowledge of available sources, and their comceptual orientation derived from their recent training would, we thought, provide us with the best means of getting an up-to-date product. They were initially instructed in the objectives of the exercise and the frames of reference they were to use. They too had to adopt a similar, single-minded focus --the relevancy of the writings they were examining for the teacher who was teaching disadvantaged children. They were charged: to (i) survey all contemporary writing that dealt with the disadvantaged condition, (ii) abstract from each example whatever was thought to be (even remotely) relevant to the central issue, (iii) organize the abstracts so that listed after the bibliographical data, were (a) a statement of facts that were empirically supported (or were known to be empirically supportable), (b) a statement of assertions not empirically supported, (c) any relevant recommendations made within the article, and (d) where thought necessary, any comments. The abstracted material was then recorded onto McBee cards. Subsequently, the complete array of McBee

cards was studied in order that a basis for conceptual mapping of the whole area could be developed. Thereupon, the McBee cards were again examined, this time to relate their content to the respective conceptual categories. This completed, we would then have a systematically ordered and organized set of information on which the next stage of the planning process could build. The next stage was to involve the construction of a set of behavioral objectives consonant with the distilled information, and appropriate for teachers of disadvantaged children.

This present report presents the outcomes of the examination of the Social Work area. Specifically it records (i) the deliberations of the Social Work consortium, (ii) a condensed version of the material abstracted in the literature search, (iii) a conceptual mapping of the field, accompanied by brief listings of relevant facts, (iv) a final summation. The report has been organized on two assumptions. First that the gathering together of Social Work information relevant to the education of the disadvantaged would prove useful to those concerned with developing teacher training programs. In this sense, the report is a source book. Second, that the outcomes of our own deliberations on the problems of educating disadvantaged children might also prove helpful to others who have similar concerns. However, because we recognize that the planners of training programs are as uniquely individualistic as the problems they confront, our emphasis is on the first rather than the second. Most readers, we assume, will make use of the first three sections. We of course, will make most use of the fourth. It will provide the pad from which the next step of practical implementation will be launched.

As well as the co-directors a number of people involved in this part of the project should receive special mention. Initially, fiscal responsibility for the project rested with Dean Keys. When he accepted appointment at Kansas State University the task was taken up by B. Charles Leonard. Susan Sanders, Susan Jameson and Sally Leary took major responsibility for the literature search. They did so under the administrative care of Fred Gies and Barney Madden, both of whom took administrative responsibility for the other literature searches as well. The fact that the writer of this manuscript did so on the other side of the earth placed additional burden on Charles Leonard and Fred Gies.

Their liaison activities have been much appreciated. Much appreciated too has been the efficient service provided first by Kirsten Morgan who both steered the enterprise here expertly and typed the manuscript, and my Terence Halliday who provided a variety of back-up services.

Raymond S. Adams,
Palmerston North,
New Zealand,
October 1970.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Section I:	The Consortium	1
Section II:	Literature search abstracts (alphabetically by author)	81
Section III:	Abstracted information:	119
	The Family Unit	120
	Negativism toward the poor and poverty by the non-poor	124
	Impact of poverty on the poor	126
	Behavioral characteristics of the poor	128
	Inferred psychological characteristics of the poor	132
	Characteristics of thought processes and verbal skills of the poor	136
	The disadvantaged Negro (with selected comments applicable to other minority populations)	138
	Education and the disadvantaged	142
	Recommendations relevant to educating the disadvantaged and for improving their situation	148
Section IV:	Summation	153
	Education - Social Work similarities	153
	Social Work - Education differences	157
	Extrapolation: From social work to education	163
	Teacher expectations	165
	The teacher in the organisation	178
	Discussion	182

SECTION I

This section is devoted entirely to the consortium held in New York in January 1970. Its participants were:

Dr. Bertram Beck,
Executive Director,
Mobilization for Youth, New York

Dean James R. Dumpson,
School of Social Science,
Fordham University

Professor Ira Gibbons,
School of Social Work,
Howard University

Professor Carol H. Meyer,
School of Social Work,
Columbia University, New York

Professor Meyer Schwartz,
School of Social Work,
University of Pittsburgh

and, as moderator,

Professor Raymond S. Adams,
College of Education, and
Center for Research in Social Behavior,
University of Missouri at Columbia.

The detail of the consortium's discussion is contained in the bulk of the paragraphs that follow. What may not be apparent, because of the impersonality of the printed word, is the extent of sympathetic intensity manifested throughout the discussion. It was obvious that our concern was theirs, and that the sincerity of our desire to resolve problems was matched by their willingness to help. It is hoped that some impression of this general atmosphere of goodwill and integrity of purpose remains. If it does not, the fault lies with the editor and the printed medium rather than with the participants.

Several conventions have been used in editing the transcript.

First, although the speakers have not been identified separately the moderator has been--so that his social work naivete will not be mistakingly attributed to the experts. Speakers are denoted with one asterisk, the moderator with two. Second, an attempt has been made to preserve the essential messages of the discussion faithfully. However, in order to go part-way towards meeting the expectations that readers might have about printed script, an attempt has been made to observe the more generally accepted conventions of written language.

The transcript of the discussion takes up at the point where the moderator was summarising the purposes of the enquiry.

** *I presume that what I should do first of all is give an outline of what the project is all about. Then I suspect we should visit a little over general problems. Finally, I've got some focussing questions that can come up later on.*

Basically, the project was developed in response to a nationwide U.S. Office of Education request for programs that would bring about reform in teacher training. Because we felt there was a valid need, we focussed on the education of the disadvantaged. We thereupon argued that if we were going to reform teacher training, and in particular introduce systems whereby the trainers of teachers themselves would be trained, we had to be sure we had a viable system for producing teachers in the first place. We recognized that there wasn't any good research that would give us a firm foundation for stating unequivocally that any particular way was the best way to go about teacher training. We recognized that education was limited in its insights. But we argued that there might however, be insights, knowledge, and understanding available in other disciplines and that education could make use of them. But the problem was to get communication between the other disciplines and education. For instance, if there are relevant sociological insights, it is a little bit difficult for educationists to get hold of them without their becoming sociologists first. So we thought we should try to establish bridges between the relevant social science disciplines and education. We proposed therefore to tap the resources available in social work, community development, sociolinguistics, in social psychology and sociology and, as well, in educational research itself.

Our procedure was to go to these areas and say: "Given what is known in the discipline, given the discipline's insights, irrespective of whether they are supported or not, what does it seem that the teacher of underprivileged youngsters needs to know, think, feel and understand?" We have two strategies operating. One of these is to accumulate experts (like yourselves), sit them down together, confront them with our key question and get their discussion on the question. Coincidentally with this strategy we have a literature search going on in each of the several areas. This is being undertaken by graduate students from the respective disciplines. So for example, we have social work graduate students doing research on social work literature. Here again the searchers have our central question in mind. They look for anything that they think, given the social work perspective, is (even marginally) relevant to our problem. Now, once we have obtained these two sets of information our problem is to organize them and relate them to an educational model--a kind of process of refining and filtering. This done, we would have a basis for adapting social work insights to our own purposes--the setting up of a program to train teachers of disadvantaged children. At the moment we have only completed the linguistics study, and we have a report that testifies to our efforts. In the report, half is devoted to a consortium (like this one). The other half is organized in this particular way: (I'll recount it because I think that it explains our orientation the best.) The first section attempts to set up a conceptual framework which accommodates the twin ideas of disadvantagedness and sociolinguistics. So, we say in effect, when sociolinguistics and disadvantaged education are brought together, the problem seems to be able to be specified in certain terms. The dimensions of the problem, the elements of the problem, can be stipulated in precise terms. This conceptual framework sets the rules for the rest of the play. So we take the conceptual framework and ask: to what extent does research bear on the model--what information is available from the literature search in particular, and from other sources available to us. This is merely a matter of reporting. The second section of this part of the report deals with recommendations that have been made--irrespective of the quality of the recommendation and irrespective of the basis for the recommendation. We felt this necessary because we find

that when people deal with educational issues, they tend to make recommendations. Given their sincerety of purpose, we thought we should recognize the recommendations for what they are worth. Finally in this section, the information that has been generated up to this point is subjected to further examination and our recommendations for the reform of the teacher training program are put forward as a summation.

When this same procedure has been completed in all of the areas chosen we will finish up with at least six different points of view. Whether they gel or not remains to be seen. I suspect that there will be points over which there will be quite substantial conflict. But merely to know of the conflict, and to be able to express it is, I think, to begin to lead toward the solution of that conflict. However, when we've got these six points of view, our next step will be to start creating a teacher training program that accommodates them. At that point, the educationists take over. Their problem becomes; given these desiderata, how can they be converted to behavioral objectives that are both educationally feasible and practicable for our training program? What, in other words, should our trainees who have been through the program be able to do when they've finished it? Once these behavioral objectives are specified we then devise programs complete with curricula, aids, perhaps filmstrips, perhaps programmed instruction, perhaps video-tapes, perhaps simulated situations, etc. that would lead to the desired end result. Now, we assume that in this process there will be substantial contact with the world outside. One of our basic feelings at any rate, is that there should be a closer connection between the real world and the teacher training system. When we are at that stage in devising the program, we want to involve, very directly, communities and societies that are archetypical communities and societies for our students. This is so that they have some sort of familiarity with the kinds of conditions they are going to meet and some kind of direct contact with the people who live in them. In other words, so that they get some affinity with reality.

That's the whole project. Perhaps there are questions that you would like to ask at this point.

* I'll aks one. How do you define the educationally disadvantaged?

** Very, very loosely--except we are confined by a need to restrict ourselves to urban disadvantaged. We tend to define it rather sociologically--anything that anybody calls disadvantaged is for our purposes acceptable as disadvantaged. Does that make sense?

* Yes. The reason I ask is that there is a tendency in literature and education generally; particularly in an urban context, to use educationally disadvantaged and minority interchangeably. Of course, I take the position that all minority students are not necessarily disadvantaged educationally. So I wanted to know whether we're being.....

** I don't think we feel any compulsion to confine it to that at all.

* In other words, a large part of the educationally disadvantaged is a minority group?

* Did you say your position is that all minority people are disadvantaged educationally? Did you say that?

* No. On the contrary, I said that all minority groups are not educationally disadvantaged; even though they represent in many centers a large part of the educationally disadvantaged.

** I suppose there are two fundamental assumptions that underlie our approach. The first one is that, in the best of all possible worlds, education should be systematically organized and should know what it's about so that it can support its particular positions by citing empirical evidence. We would like to have the evidence that states if you do A, then such and such follows. We know we don't have it, but we'd like to lead towards this to some extent. The second assumption we make, is that we would, in the best of all possible worlds, like our teachers to be professionals. So we presume it is they who are going to make the professional judgements about what they should do in specific situations. However, we are committed to the belief that they will only be able to do this if they get the kind of education that gives them a series of internalized alternatives that they can choose among according to the demands of the situation.

* Then why do you want to guarantee the outcome? I mean, why would that be desirable?

** You said guarantee--I don't believe I did.

* Well, you said desirable.

** It would be desirable to have that sort of basis I presume because if a teacher is going to make a judgement among alternatives, she should do so on the basis of whatever evidence she has that this particular judgement is going to pay off.

* So, you're not interested in the outcome of the teacher having specific behaviors, but that he makes a sound judgement as a professional?

** Yes. Which implies that she's going to have some ability to diagnose the problem in terms of her professional training and bring to bear on that diagnosis the understanding she has of the specific situation.

Perhaps I should make a couple of final comments, and then I should stop talking. The first is that I'm not an American--I'm a New Zealander, which means that I have experienced a different kind of educational system, both at school and university. One of the characteristics of that university system is that one tends to be exposed to an ecclectic approach rather than a specialized training approach. For this reason, I'm sort of a Jack-of-a-number-of-trades by American standards, an probably master of none. I'm classified as an educational sociologist now--that's mainly to keep my American friends happy who've got to put a label on me. And I've got some background in educational psychology and a certain amount of background in educational sociology. As an amateur I've done a bit of social work in that I've run camps and a small institution for delinquent boys, and I've worked with a group of delinquent children and I was an advisor to a women's prison. However, I'm not trained as a social worker; my understandings are limited. Ira's been assiduously working on me in the last four or five hours, but despite his very good job, you will have to, from time to time, explain things to me a little, and you may have to excuse the naivete of some of my questions. However, remember, you're talking to other educationists as well and some of them will be ignorant of social work too. Now given our relative ignorance, the fact that we've incorporated social work into our project is partly an act of faith and partly an act of conviction. We feel that social work's insights and understandings could and should be relevant to education. But we are not 100% sure how they will be. So to this extent, it's going to be very interesting to see how you see the problem. It is <u>your</u> point of view that we want rather than any attempt at

accommodating an educational point of view. Does that make sense?

I suggest we should talk round the problem for a little bit and then later on perhaps focus on some questions that I would like to ask.

* Well, I'd like to comment again on the point raised earlier about the meaning of disadvantaged--not as a semantic quibble but as it effects the formulation of the problem. I think that the currently manifested interest in community control, in urban education, and in black studies, or in other kinds of heritage problem programs, is a consequence of the recognition that the expectations of many teachers of poor youngsters--youngsters from pverty-stricken homes--are too low. I think there's some evidence that teachers favor youngsters, or tend to favor youngsters, who most conform to the teacher's own background. So another way to talk about the problem would be to say that certain teachers are disadvantaged. They encounter certain groups in the population about which they are ignorant. Therefore, we have to make them advantaged as teachers. I'm not saying that it isn't true that most youngsters from poor city homes, when they encounter the school system and its instruction, are disadvantaged. But onee you put the problem that way I think that you heighten the gap between people. You know, "if this guy's disadvantaged, then I'm advantaged". And, I think that makes me see the person, or pupil, in a light that may impede my ability to teach him. So, I think that our goal has to be to get, as your program is, more effective teaching. And the emphasis has to be on heightening the advantages of the teacher rather than on the categorization of the youngsters as disadvantaged.

* I would agree with that but I'd probably put it in just a little different terms. I think it's the same thing however. That is, how does the trainer of teachers equip the teacher with what I call acceptance of difference--whatever that difference is, whether it's a difference of cultural background, whether it's a difference of class, whether it's a difference of color. I'm not just talking about an intellectual acceptance of difference which relates to expectation, but to an emotional acceptance of difference. Indeed, in some instances, I would go so far as to say that the teacher should be given some kind of equipment that helps her support difference. I would want to get away

from the old mystique that all teachers are going to come out with certain behavioral expectation levels that dares them to support difference, particularly cultural difference.

* *Wouldn't this let the Puerto Rican child be Puerto Rican and let a Chicano child be a Chicano and not try to make him a middle class white Californian or white New Yorker.*

* *I mean, a teacher must come to that urban setting, prepared to accept and support difference and to work with it.*

* *Did you ever read "A Walker of the Streets"? It's a beautiful book. It's an old book and it's really not about the present scene, but there's something in it that I've never forgotten. It's about East New York, in Brooklyn. There is this Jewish family 30 or 40 years ago and the author describes the people and the schools and in particular these kids who are bilingual by this time because they're speaking Yiddish at home. They go to school and the teachers invariably--and this was always true in those days--the teachers invariably taught them the King's English! They taught 'caln't'--they taught even worse than New Yorkese! And it was perfectly acceptable to do this; to make over these kids who were from a middle class or fancy upper class scene. And, to follow-up the earlier point, the idea was to wipe out the cultural difference.*

* *Well, there are two things I would like to comment on. One is the teacher being an accepting person, because I think this is an area that I think social work should be able to contribute to in terms of education of the teacher. I have often used the example of the mother who washes the baby and the water is dirty. And she hates dirty water so she opens the window and throws out the baby and the dirty water, as against the mother who holds the baby and throws away the dirty water. That's because we tend to identify the baby and the dirty water together. Similarly, our ideas about the disadvantaged are put out in one package. We and they come to hate the condition. We hate the way the disadvantaged looks, the way he talks, the way he walks--he comes to hate his color, to hate his religion. But when we reject the accompaniments of disadvantage we reject the people themselves. How then, do we get the teacher, or the social worker to understand that this person is a person for all that.*

** *Presumably success in social work is dependent upon the social worker's accepting the other person. This implies that either you've got particular kinds of people in social work or that they have been trained that way--it's been planned that way. So, is it possible to train people like that?*

* *Before anyone tries to answer that question let me ask this question. What is the process of selection for disadvantaged teaching--the entrance point in training teachers for the urban setting? (Because in social work there is some kind of selection process.) What control does the teacher training system have over selection?*

** *I don't think there's anything done systematically from this particular point of view. I think that the question I am forced to ask is, given the fact that we have teachers admitted to the system, to what extent are some trainable into this sensitivity, and to what extent are we committed to failure even before we start?*

* *I think one of the most valuable ingredients in social work education that moves toward this goal (which is not achieved in all instances) is field work experience. That is a very important dimension of social work education. I've also always felt that with practice teachers, there should be much more emphasis on the teacher's own response--that is, how the teacher feels and thinks about the youngsters with whom they're engaged, and about the neighborhood in which they're engaged. In the neighborhood in which I worked on the lower East Side in New York, we had a kind of a training program for teachers in which we encouraged them--and it was very difficult to do--to visit the homes of the students. We tried to appraise the results, and they were quite significant in terms of how the teachers then felt about the youngsters.....*

* *Can't that be taken a few steps further? If I may presume to enter into the educational field in the training of teachers; teaching practice seems to be particularly restricted. Why not extend the concept of teaching practice by not confining it to the classroom and have a period of time in which the teacher gets credit for actually engaging in some kind of activity in the neighborhood environment where the disadvantaged live. They would get the experience in there, under supervision. And maybe living in neighborhood housing, perhaps involved in some type of community project. I would think there would*

be a carry-over from that to how they orientate themselves to their teacher problems in the classroom. This would mean enlarging the concept of teaching. We truly want to get the person to get a full set of some sort of background responses. They will, even so, be restricted because home-visiting is only a series of one-shot affairs and also, the atmosphere of a home visit is kind of contricted.

* Did your students have supervision?

* Yes.

* In my own university an attempt was made to marry to some extent the school of education's training program with the school of social work. We named a faculty member to the school of education to help develop field work placements in social agencies for a group of teachers who were being trained as part of our T.T.T. program. Supervision was provided--dual supervision between the social work educator and the education educator for a period of time. Our faculty person made the contacts and set up the learning experiences in the social agencies. Admittedly it was a brief period. Of course, this was not field instruction in the sense that we were looking at it in the field of social work, but this was an attempt at meeting the problem.

* There's another point I've noticed,within the city neighborhoods there is a strong conflict situation within the school. There are struggles going on between neighborhoods and schools. And it seems that teachers get uptight out of social context--very uptight. Then communication becomes blocked completely. There are two different worlds here almost--the school and the community. This is the way the parents and the people in the neighborhood see it. Now, is there any way that teacher education can expose the teacher in such a way that he has a better understanding of that conflict situation and its manageability, if any at all? This would mean that the teacher wouldn't be so uptight when these confrontations take place again, and again. She would be able to have some skill in entering into those discussions. Unless we give the teacher some experience somewhere outside the classroom, so to speak, how is the teacher going to get that? Now of course, all sorts of institutional forces are going to oppose doing that very thing for the teacher. You see, to allow them to do that--to go about getting that introduced into teacher training--that's a

political question.

** *I don't see any theoretical objection at all. Now that we've got it in the record, that's fine. Let's visit with the idea a bit. It seems to me, however, that mere exposure just isn't enough. It's like putting a grad. student in the classroom and saying; "this is what it's like teaching in the classroom". So, question; have you got insights from social work so that you can talk about the way in which these experiences can be organized in the inevitably short space of time that is available; so that there are a wide range of experiences that can be perceived systematically, analytically, and clearly? You see, one of the problems in guidance and teacher training is, I think, that it really often depends on the insights of the overseer. What happens when a teacher educator views a lesson taken by a trainee for example, is that the advisor brings out a lot of intuitive responses without ever giving the student the basis on which the responses rest.*

* *I'd like to respond to that. I think in principle it is very important, for us as well as for you, to spell out the most parsimonious approach possible. And social work has gone down the primrose path for years trying to do fancy things about developing insights, about one's feelings and so forth, about people who are different. And I think we've learned over the years that there are more economical ways to do it. One of the experiences I had touches on this. A few years ago I was on a panel at Teacher's College, Columbia, where something of this was happening and there were some political leaders and some social work theoreticians and policy types--and me. I was the one teacher of social work--a practitioner, at least, that's my orientation. And the theories were going all over the place. This was to an audience of student teachers. And there they were, taking notes and taking notes. And I was watching them. I was next to last on the panel and they weren't really into it at all. What they were getting was a lot of talk, which was all very interesting on one level, but it had nothing whatsoever to do with their concerns--which were similar to the concerns you are raising about the school system. These were very gung-ho young students. They were very active as students and the talk wasn't enough. And I was struck with just this question you know, how do you help them to get started to do something besides simply theorizing, which is so easy but*

not necessarily useful. So I threw away what I was going to do, because I felt that somebody had to kind of pin it down. As a matter of fact, it was the only thing that came out in their class books later. And it wasn't fancy. The remarks that I made were very pedestrian (I was kind of embarrassed when I saw them). And I was not talking about values and attitudes (I wouldn't insult them that way). I asked them about concrete things, for example; did they know, did they have any idea, when they ask students to wear a white shirt and a tie to school, did they have any idea what that meant to a family living on a welfare budget. Well, they didn't. They literally didn't. They didn't have any thought--and these are, you know, very simple concrete things. They didn't have any thought about what ironing every night meant to a mother who has got five kids. There were still people in the city then, still teachers and still principals who were insisting upon having a starched white collar. Maybe that's an extreme example, but do they have any idea or knowledge about the very concrete observable things that any kind of a human being teacher would be appalled at if they really knew. Like, do they have any idea of what it's like to go to school hungry--to be really hungry--you know. But I think that is certainly the beginning way in which attitudes change. Through the simple reorganization of data in one's mind.

** *I think you've put your finger on one of the things that are very important. And that is, on going through the experiences and so on, how do you get them over to anybody? Well, in the first place, I consider thinking as a tool. And that is where we have to start. It is not going through the motions; not making the observations. But unless you somehow have the perceptions to beging to see relationships in the experience and to begin to think through and to understand in a way that is helpful and meaningful to the individual himself, the experience is worthless. Because otherwise you are not going to get behavioral change. But when a person feels that this is the way he <u>has</u> to act under this condition, and he does act this way because he thinks this way, then the education has been successful. And all too often in field instruction, you know, in these various experiences, we have the student go through them and once the person has gone through them, we assume that something rubbed off. But very little or nothing*

may have rubbed off, unless we assure that there is a connecting link of thought which can be used as a tool.

** *Ive got a question that I wanted to ask earlier that is based on this point. It seems to me that we get a lot more persons in teaching who come to us with messianic zeal--they're going to improve the world. Also, they're going to improve it in <u>their</u> way, because they're extremely confident--in their own quiet, insecure ways--that they've got <u>the</u> answer.*

Now, obviously we've got to retrain their--whatever it is--and the question is, how to do it? Are we still talking about the same subject?

* *I think it's a different subject. I think it's an important question, but I think it's a different subject.*

* *It's a different subject, except that if you consider it from the point of view of really getting to know what reality is--from a reality orientation.*

** *You know, if you've got sweet little 'Hitlers' who are going to be teachers and you want to modify their attitudes and understandings and insights and behaviors, is it more difficult to modify these particular sweet little Hitlers, or do we need different kinds of people?*

* *That's not so difficult because they're saying it out. Anything that's out on the table you can deal with. It's the quiet ones that are doing it, I find more difficult. If they're announcing that they intend to reform society in their image, then it's out on the table for one to argue about.*

* *And you see, your program is teaching trainers of teachers.....*

** *Eventually! But our assumption is that we'd better know how to teach teachers before we start to teach trainers how to teach teachers.*

* *All right. But you see, I'm linking up two points. First, you've got somebody who is saying you know, "this is the way that I'm going to save the world". Second, you've got the selection process. Now, I'm not sure that in two years, four years, teacher training can change people sufficiently if they have this messianic bit. God help us, I recall the teachers and the principals who used to write to me as Commission of Welfare about the youngsters on relief..... "and <u>if</u> they would wash their face in the morning, and <u>if</u> mother would take care of*

them, we would be able to teach them." I came to the conclusion that the superintendent of schools was never going to make a change in those principals and those teachers. And I'm not sure, if they were those kind of people at the entrance point, that the training system could do very much about changing them unless you were to take a large part of the model of social work education into teacher education. In our program we didn't just take these teachers to social agencies and kind of put them up with families and groups and so forth. We took a social work educator and a person in the school of education who sat in supervisory conferences, in groups and seminars afterwards, and began to tease out how these people felt about what they had seen and experienced.

** And this worked?

* We don't know if it has worked, but it looks promising.

* Before we go further though, I'm troubled with what you said. I wish you'd differentiate between what you called the sweet little Hitlers--which to me is a certain kind of anathema, the kind of person who ought to be screened out--and the idealist. I think there's a matter of definition here. The idealistic, activist student sees a lot wrong in social institutions and wants to change them. I personally object a little bit to saying that these kids will be the sweet little Hitlers because they want to change it their way. You know, their way may not be so bad!

** O.K. I think that my rash generalization was based upon the idea that most of the kids who come into schools of education come in because they do want to bring about a particular kind of change. But it's change in the direction that they want to go, and this change is very much in the direction of conventional middle class ideals. You know, they're middle class themselves. They've been exposed to the 'correct pronunciation'. They know how to wash. And, you know, they have their terribly well internalized middle class values. Now, without even questioning them, these are the values that they're perpetuating, and perpetrating on others. And they go about this with meticulous thoroughness without ever questioning it. To this extent I think that this is sort of Hitler-like behavior in the sense that it is unidirectional and it's dedicated. But they're sweet because they

believe in it. They value it. They are convinced.

* *Oh, I thought you were talking about a completely different thing.*

* *Something that has worked pretty well in my own experience is the use of one of the so-called new careerists in social work. That is, where we take social workers who come through formal education and therefore are the kind of people who would be likely to getting Master's Degrees, and have them work alongside of people from the neighborhood who have not had extensive formal education. I find that as the human relationship develops between the two people there is a very healthy exchange of ideas and of information concerning life-styles. I know of course, that in education there are similar kinds of developments, and I think that's one that might be workable.*

When you were talking before about those 'sweet little Hitlers', I thought you had in mind the kind of young person that I find increasingly in social work--who come out of the schools of social work (maybe you don't have this problem) and say that the evils of this world come from the military-industrial complex. Then, when you try and help them work on problems that are right here, you know, right in front of them, they're way off into the wild blue yonder, in large scale fury. But unless you can help them deal with what's at hand, they're not really doing their work.

** *I don't think we do, at least not yet. And in a way it's sad that we don't. Because at the moment there is such unquestioning acceptance of their own values.*

* *Interesting, very interesting.*

** *It seems to me that when teachers approach teaching from this particular point of view, in effect they say to the kids; "I am the authority. What I have to say is what you have to know or believe or follow". Now, it also seems to me as if in their manipulation of the situation they still persistently come back to the assumption that they are the authority. Now, question: If, in fact, we make our new teachers so sensitive to difference and to other peoples' way of thinking and believing that they can see the difference between themselves and the others, how do we then get them to feel that they can <u>accept</u> the difference?*

* *Start with knowledge. You <u>have</u> to start with knowledge.*

** However, whatever you do, you're also going to undermine the teacher's security. They're secure as teachers because they know they're right. And now suddenly they've got two alternatives.

* I wish you'd say a little more about what you mean when you say knowledge.

* Say, for example, you have this problem that they're sure they're right. There are a lot of questions that can follow. Why are they sure they're right? What kinds of outcomes would they expect from being right? Have they noticed a great deal of success following from their position? You follow it through so that their minds, so that their cognition, is affected. I would challenge (just as I would with any student) a student's neglect to translate his 'knowledge' into social work terms. For example, a student might say (and this is a very typical situation); "All unmarried mothers ought to give up their babies". A young, first year student would say that--would come in with all the morality, and all that middle class virtue. Now, you can approach that from the very deep, deep psychological level--which we've tried to do, but I've given it up, it doesn't go anywhere. Or you can approach it from a purely intellectual angle--which gets emotional (it gets emotionalized really). You know: "All married mothers?" "Is there a place, for example, for black babies to go when the unmarried mother gives it up?" Immediately, a smart student will begin to qualify. "Oh, no, well maybe not all black babies". "What about the mother who says, that she's got a place?" "Oh well, maybe we'll rule out that one". "And then what about the fact that you're not in charge"; "what about the fact of self-determination";"what about, what about?" until finally the student says, "Oh, my god! What have I said? Maybe people ought to be helped to make their own decision about it". Now, that doesn't happen in a minute. That happens in the classroom. It happens as she talks to her peers. It happens in field work when she has her first unmarried mother and the supervisor says; "Maybe this gal wants to keep her baby". You know, it starts through the head.

* That's all very well for us. We have continuous organizational back-up for this kind of thing. The school system is, and so far, the teachers are, almost isolated, so to speak. So much depends upon the

entire complex. And the school system, I dare say, probably is right with the principal. So while you can have teachers change in this way if that principal, to put it very plainly and from my point of view, is a son-of-a-bitch, it gets shaken out of them right there and then. I know that some social agencies just can't tolerate this sort of growing up of personnel with new ways of doing things and having other attitudes and behaviors. They just can't take it. Now, principals, as far as I can understand from what I've observed, are pretty much in charge. The troops fall in behind.

* *When you were talking about knowledge, I would want to add another component, and that is the knowledge that a teacher can get through an understanding that this group of disadvantaged children, this community and its life-style, will provide some support that will help him with that s.o.b. principal. For example quote, "Are all socially disadvantaged children stupid?" What does the record show?*

* *But this comes from an investment of self in that community. Let's continue with the questions. "Are all disadvantaged communities 'X'?" "Let's look at the power structure in that community." "Let's look at some of the things that go on there"--some of the things that this middle class student, or middle class oriented teacher, or the principal, knows nothing about. So I guess that what I'm saying is that a whole area of knowledge and experience has to come into teacher training that can't be found only in the classroom. And it may not necessarily come through a social agency either but somehow that teacher has got to get an awareness, knowledge and experience of what makes that community tick.*

I live on the fringe of El Bareo and I see, every morning I see a group of Puerto Rican children go to school. I must say parenthetically, I've been immeasurably impressed--this is 110th street, you know--the youngsters have their Sunday go-to-meeting clothes on--all dressed up! And they come out of those god-awful houses. I shudder every time I just look in the hallways. Yet these kids come out and they have been scrubbed and brushed, and so forth. Now, I see the mothers taking them by their hands and I am sure that in some communities the concept, the perception of the Puerto Rican is quite different from what one observes in the El Bareo. But to get back to these kids. They come down

110th street and they get to 110th and Madison and maybe on the corner of 110th and Madison are a couple of guys who are standing up asleep-- you know, drug addicts. Those kids pass that. And they pass a series of such like experiences. Last week those kids passed by that Methodist church were the Young Lords have taken over the church because they wanted to prepare breakfasts. All I'm getting at is that these children bring with them to school this variety of experiences in this community. And the teacher could and should get some of this.

* Then maybe the teacher can't say quite so easily, "See Spot run".

* It seems to me that the 'old' teacher, the old principal, is gonna have to give, either change or get the hell out of there! That's what community control of schools is all about.

* I think the key question in teacher training and in aid training is "why?"

** This was the implicit question in the illustration you gave before. What you were saying to your social worker was; "think 'why'" Now, I don't think this would be characteristic of teacher training.....

* This is the thing that makes the difference between a technician and a professional.

** O.K. Do you have any secrets about teaching social workers to think 'why'?

* That's not only our asset, that's our greatest limitation! Because then the students get angry at us and they say; "Nobody around here ever gives you an answer!"

* There's another question too that we've been talking about. It comes out in the illustration you just gave of the Puerto Ricans being dressed up to go to school. It has to do with something that started around the beginning of the twentieth century and as we come into the twenty-first I don't think we've even gotten rid of it yet. It's of concern to the teacher and the social worker, and so on. That is, the idea of the American Melting Pot; the feeling that all of us have to be in one mold, you know. And if you don't melt in that mold you are disloyal and unpatriotic. This of course goes back to the Founding Fathers and the idea that homogeneity would characterize the American society. It needs to be surfaced how this molds our thinking and our resistance to cultural pluralism. Not only that, it seems to

me that another contribution that social work can make, has to do with individuality, individualism. The social work student is expected to individualize the people with whom he's working, so that he gets to know this person as a person--as a member of a group too, but nonetheless a person. As over against this, in the classroom there's the tendency to say that these are 'Puerto Rican' children, these are 'black' children, these are 'white' children and so on. So the teacher relates to the individual child as if he's part of the whole group. What she sees in one are the characteristic (stereotypes) of the group. What the group is like the individual is like. And she does this without stopping to ask why does this individual behave the way he does; and without being able to differentiate behaviors. So, here again, it seems to me that one of the things you might look at is how do you help teachers to individualize children?

* Part of the way we do it in schools of social work, I think, is to individualize the student in training himself. I mean, part of it is the model that we provide as teachers. And so, for example, when a student is scared, the way in which one handles that student may change his life about the way he individualizes other people too. That's not a minor point.

* Which brings me to teacher training. You teach certain concepts with the teacher in training but how do you help the teacher and how do you develop procedures, educational experiences, that will help the teacher to develop and emphasize her own style. In schools of social work, you know, every faculty member is an individual, and nobody, NOBODY, the President, the Dean, the Chairman of the curriculum area, would dare invade the teaching style of another colleague. And students get this. But now in teacher training, you know, the model is pretty universal. You teach arithmetic, and unless it has changed (and I doubt that it has) there's an outline for a lesson plan and every teacher submits a lesson plan! Where's the style? I may not want to use that lesson plan.

* Too much teaching is method. You know that.

* Teaching of method crushes the ki nd of creativity and use of individual style.

** This may be another general question. It seems to me that there

are at least two factors that distinguish the teacher situation from the social work situation. The first is that the teacher does have a quantity of clients to deal with at any appointed time--you know, twenty or thirty maybe. So, she's got the problem of what the other twenty-nine are doing while she is dealing with number thirty. The second is that (and it's hard to imagine education in other terms) there is also a prescribed content which, even if it were flexible, nonetheless has to be conveyed some way or another. For instance, there are skills that, it appears, have to be learned, have to be acquired. It seems to me that these are two constraints that the teachers have to deal with.

* *May I just say parenthetically we don't call the people clients. You know, that is something we've got to get away from in social work. So please don't have teachers dealing with 30 clients. I just wanted to inject that.*

* *To your second question, about the teaching thing, I've always wondered where it was written that teachers had to have a lesson plan week by week. I mean, they might have their internal lesson plan but why can't they be held responsible for teaching what the students need to know by the end of the semester, or by the end of the year, so that they can do it their way. I mean, what this constriction means is that when they get hot on a subject, the schedule says that next week they've got to do something else instead.*

** *I wouldn't want to try to defend this when I can't defend it. My own fundamental assumption is that when teachers are professional they determine what they should do in each particular case.*

However, there is something else that I think is probably worth a little digression. It seems to me (not only to me but to respectable theoreticians, like Parsons, for instance) that the function of the school is partly as a selective agency. It allocates people to positions in society. So it needs to develop systems for fostering the allocation process. As a result the system also applies the evaluation idea to teachers. Now obviously it's a very convenient basis to evaluate teachers if they diverge from a specified program. The principal thus has an easy way of making a judgement about his teachers, so that he can allocate them to different positions. He's got a method for deciding

which teacher is a good teacher or a bad teacher. And although it's a bloody unreasonable method, it is a method.

* *You named two differences between social work and education. It seems to me that there is another difference that really is very much an asset for teacher training, and it bears on changing the system. That is, one can hold the teacher or principal accountable for outcome in a way that it is very hard, I think, to hold social workers accountable.*

** *But that's why you've got lesson plans.*

* *But no, suppose for example (this is common enough) the parents, who are the key concern you know, say that they want their children to read. Or they say they'd like their children to be interested enough in school to go and stay there. These are, I would say, roughly, measurable things.*

** *They may be incompatible. It may be that if the teacher teaches the children to read, they won't be able to get the kids to stay at school because the process will be pretty grim.*

* *But this is at least the teacher's job, it would seem to me. And one could say to the principals, this is a problem of the teachers, rather than saying as we do now, if youngsters are not learning or they're dropping out in droves that they are disadvantaged and that's their problem.*

* *I was baffled. Let's see if I can follow through on that. Teachers in training should learn that they have some support within the system; and that there is support somewhere in the community also; and that it probably resides amond a great many parents--according to my observations reached in the past five years. Contrasted with twenty years ago, parents of disadvantaged children <u>want</u> education. It's the greatest thing that's happened recently. You can see that expression; they <u>want</u> education. Any theories that anybody had about them not wanting education you can throw out the window. They want their kids to be educated. They want them to read, write and so on and so forth. Now, the problem is how to get teachers in training to understand and work with parents. Now with the entrance of teacher aids, and so-called para-professionals into teacher training, the problem is how to get the trainees to understand that the aids can be helpful and have a unique contribution to make. The teachers have to learn what it is to supervize*

how to provide support, and receive it. Not only that, they should understand that in confronting the entire system and in helping to change it, they have allies that they can call upon so to speak. You have to get that across. There has to be some experience with that though, to be able to do it properly.

** You mean that you would like the teacher to be aware of how the system in which she works operates--both from the point of view of potential support and potential opposition.

* Sure. It makes their job easier. Actually easier.

** I'll buy that.

* I think it makes sense. I think they themselves will appreciate it because the classical picture has been the teacher versus the parent.

** And the teacher versus the kids.

* But with the disadvantaged I would like to insist that there the teacher versus the parents is more accentuated. But in the middle class there's an alliance between the middle class and the teacher. I'll give you an example from an Italian neighborhood. I was doing a quick study for some social organization in Pittsburgh. And I went to interview the black principal of a mainly white elementary school. And into the office strode the President of the Parent-Teacher Association. She made a quick request for her child to switch classes--from one teacher to another. The alliance between a principal and one parent--the President of the P.T.A. That was one incident, a simple pay-off incident. But sometimes a simple incident suddenly opens up a whole world to you. You know, we have got to work out a way so that there's a pay-off for the parents of the other children too. There are pay-offs blatently in this system. Parent-Teacher officials, parents of the middle class, have been paid-off again and again and again. From my own experience I can now see this very vividly. The problem is to get some support that don't just come from and for middle class families. Is there any way of chaning that situation and have the rewards in there for non-middle class parents. But there have to be rewards for teachers too--so that there is a mutual reward system that will make the thing workable.

** Can there be equality of reward opportunity for all?

* I'd like to correct something you said. I think I might have been

misunderstood. Just go back a step. I was not saying that teachers should not have lesson plans. Everybody has to have some plan for what they're going to do for their class for the next three weeks or the unit or whatever. All I'm saying is that there ought to be more lee-way in how long it takes the teacher to complete that unit--a week, a month, or whatever--I don't know how often. The reason is that everybody will come out differently. So teachers would be accountable to cover the subject. If it's a good teacher it will take him longer. I mean, the teacher who really helps the students participate, he shouldn't finish too quickly--it's easy to lecture. Our worst teachers lecture! So, it's not that there shouldn't be a plan; it's that there should be flexibility in it, with accountability built in.

* I'd like to go back to something that you mentioned just now. Where you talked of the teacher who has thirty children, and what happens to the other twenty-nine when one is being given individual attention. What is it that the teacher is trying to do?--either with that one or the other twenty-nine. The answer to that question gets us into something that I think runs parallel with social work as you work with the individual. Hopefully, both are trying to develop the human potentialities within that individual. This moves me into a question; how come we emphasize teaching so much--the teacher, the teaching--what about learning? What can be said about learning? What can be said about the children? What can be said about the students? Because if you do all the teaching you want to, at least if you only think you're doing it, nothing really happens unless that child, or the students, are learning. And I wish we'd spend some time around this, because you see if we don't, we're one-sided.

* This ties into something I want to challenge, and I have a reason for doing so that goes deeper than just the statement itself. When we were talking about the child who goes to school, stays, and is being taught to read, and you said that they might be incompatible.....

** Wanting to stay!

* .....wanting to stay and being taught to read. And that leads me to ask the question as to how teacher training helps teachers know something about the concept of 'relationships'. I bring it up because I look at what's happened to the Street Academy here in Harlem, and I

don't believe that it's any special skill that those teacher have that have gotten those kids off the street, into an academy, and now into the various universities in this area. I think that the unique ingredient has really been what we call relationship. Somebody cared! And that somebody is that teacher who may not even know very much about the subject matter--none of those teachers up there in the Academy have Ph.D.s although some of them do have Masters. But what facilitated the learning was, I think, what those teachers in the Street Academy demondstrated. I think social workers would refer to it as relationship.

** *You were making the point in response to my suggestion that it might be incompatible to have kids like school and learn reading at the same time. Now what I was trying to imply was that the teachers have certain preconceptions about how to teach that just don't gibe with encouraging children to like school. In particular when they approach the teaching of reading in the inner city they make the assumption that the conventional speech the kids use is in fact inappropriate. Consequently, they are continuously saying, "You're wrong. The right way to say it is this". The message they perpetuate to the kids of not only that they are linguistically wrong, but the way the behave is wrong, and the way the behave is bad, and that they are bad and therefore inferior.*

* *This takes me back to my first observation of acception of difference. If that isn't there, there is no teaching, no learning, nothing.*

* *You know, "Beyond the Melting Pot" would be a very good text for the trainer of teachers to have--to face the reality that this is not a melting pot society, and then have a good go around in class about what that means to them.*

* *You're going to foment all sorts of social unrest, aren't you?*

* *But isn't this what we really see as the function of education--social control. (At least some people do.)*

** *In other words, you want to expose the nature of the societal game.*

* *Of course.*

* *That's right.*

* *Much more important than 'have-to' courses.*

* *Have-to courses will never get your desired objectives, I think. In the first place, it's a carry over. In the second place, it's an overlay over very sick attitudes. And if you can get those sick attitudes out, I don't think you're promoting social unrest. There is social unrest. It's a fact of life. And I don't see why teachers should be protected from it.*

* *..... and thirdly, there is no opportunity for the development of judgement.*

* *That's right. In a way you are kind of oppressing the teacher the way the teacher oppresses the students. It's like saying, "No, there is no Santa Claus" or "Yes, there is a Santa Claus". Instead of helping professional people grapple with real issues. They don't have to like them but that's the name of the game if they are really professional.*

* *What I'm trying to get to is the idea of self-concept you get in learning. I'll tell you what I'm doing. I'm shifting from teachers to learning, to the self-concept in learning, to the importance of the self-concept, to the children we are talking about. Unless a person has some appreciation of himself, some development of self-esteem, he will lack a sense of self-direction and no amount of teaching is going to give this sense of self-direction.*

* *A social worker will always go in the direction of offering advice on relationships and all of this sort of thing and yet the teaching institution, the educational institution, at least as far as the primary school is concerned, has a defined function in our society. In fact this is the case in any society and I don't think we can get away from this. So, what are the particular functions of a school system, at least manifestly? A teacher has to start from teaching reading and writing and so on and so forth. There is didactic information that has to be conveyed or else you are just missing the boat from the point of view of what teaching is about. So if you simply put it totally on the grounds of relations you fall short. You have to ask the question, relations, to what purpose? A relationship is a defined environment, it is a delimited environment. You can't put on the teacher all that goes on in the home. That's unrealistic. I want to be devil's advocate on the other side for a*

moment. Therefore, how do you use these relationships for the purpose of getting certain didactic information across. I'll put our problem on that basis, so that we don't run the risk of transferring mechanically from one situation to the other--from social work to education.

** I am bothered by something--the word didactic. I would agree that there is content that has to be transmitted, that students have to learn. Now, how they learn is up for grabs. I'm not sure that they learn through didactic methods but through a combination of approaches. For example, to teach--I don't know how to teach a roomful of children but I think I know a little about teaching social workers--and I know that you can be the smartest teacher in the world about teaching reading but unless you can expose the students to something and excite them about it, and lead them toward it (which is really what education means), no amount of didactic methodological teaching without relationship is going to mean a damn.

* I agree with you that we can't make the school system a social work system. But remember, we are talking about disadvantage which means disadvantaged parents and families which means disadvantaged communities in many instances. Disadvantaged means, therefore, that people have been denied certain opportunities for growth and development. I'm not sure that I would accept, therefore, that the school has this narrow function of relating itself to content, because so many of these children come into school from these disadvantaged areas. Because they come, never having had experience of healthy relationships with parents--because of the whole social scene, the family scene, the economic scene, etc. Now I'm not sure that the teacher does not have something to do beyond having those children for a third of the day, the waking hours,-beyond being concerned with what she teaches him to read and to count and so forth. Indeed what I'm saying is that for the disadvantaged child and the disadvantaged community, maybe the school has to become some kind of a compensatory agency.

* Couldn't a professional teacher with a teacher's aide.....

* I agree. But all I wanted to challenge was the restricted didactic view.

* Actually what's being proposed is that if you want to train teachers you have to have revision of what a school is. That's the fundamental

point. There is no sense in getting teachers trained with all these insights and just assume that it is going to work unless one has a different conception of the school.

* *If you are making that point, all right, but that's a revolutionary point of view.*

** *I would agree with you and would go beyond that to argue that you need not only to revise education but that you possibly have to revise the social system, and revise the economic system, in the sense that you bring them all into harmony with each other. However, I think that while this subject would be extremely fascinating, my own immediate preoccupation has to be with the teacher in the system <u>now</u>. To this extent, she is faced with a very present reality and we have to be concerned with that problem.*

* *Won't work!*

** *You can say it won't work in a minute if you like. Let me ask you a question first. Do you say that a teacher should not just use relationships as instrumental, as a device whereby she comes to teach the content, but in fact should come to recognize the part relationships play in life? Is that right?*

* *Yes.*

* *I'm not sure I agree. But furst I have to say something about your concern with the teacher and the system as it is now. I have to reject that because I don't believe that the now thing is going to continue to be the now thing--even in the morning or next week.*

** *It can be a different now tomorrow if you like, but nevertheless we still have to prepare teachers to teach in a defined future that will in fact be indefinite. How do we accommodate the training of teachers to this indefinite future?*

* *Of course that's the problem of social work education too because the social worker in the 1970's is going to be a different animal than he is now. So you can say, great, how are you going to train them?*

** *Yes.*

* *And this will be done by a faculty who themselves were educated in the 1940's.*

* *Right. Let me go back to this bit about the role of the school.*

I would want a reconstructed school.

** *O.K. Can I be quite blunt; you can't have it.*

* *Then I must tell you that if I can't have it, in certain parts of this country there will be no school.*

* *I agree.*

(Everyone talks at once)

* *Hold on. You're a realistic man. You know what the civil service problem is like in New York City better than most people--next to me.*

* *O.K.*

* *(We used to work together).*

* *You know what the civil service thing does and how it is the greatest leveller in the world next to death. Right?*

* *Yeah, yeah.*

* *Now teachers generally work for a civil service system of some kind. Do you really mean after hearing of all the problems he's describing about student teachers that you would trust teachers to move into the family arena. Do you really mean that you would trust our community children to them. Isn't it hard enough to trust them to teach them. You are talking about an ideal world.*

* *I didn't talk about how the school would serve the purpose, and I don't agree to teachers being all things to all men so to speak. But I will say this, today I say no to your question. I do not want to trust the children to these teachers whether the T.T.T. changes the teachers or not. Let me say it that way first. But I would say to you that in the urban communities the behavioral objectives of the schools are going to be changed either by teachers or by the consumers of the service.*

* *Now you are talking my language--parents and the community.*

* *You know, Superintendent Brown said something that was very important. I don't think that people got the import of it. When we were getting ready to elect the local school boards, he said, unless we prepare communities for the elections and the kinds of people for election--he didn't say the schools wouldn't exist, but he said that New York City would not be a good place to live in--and he's absolutely right.*

* *Right.*

* *The unrest that <u>is</u> reality is so deep and directed toward institutions like the school, that the school is either going to become a different animal in our society or it is just going to be destroyed, and something else put in its place. Now I think the teachers' training has to relate to this.....*

* *You have brought in a dimension that I could agree with. Now we are not down to pedestrian points like should sex education be taught in school. But there is a question, though I don't know if I can articulate it adequately. There's something in my gut that reacts to the idea of the school system's becoming, you know, in loco parentis. I really think it's a matter of civil liberties. You know, if I send my kid to school, I'm in charge of that child. It's my family. It's my community so I want to be on that school board and I want to tell those teachers where they are experts and where they are not. In the hospital, when I take my kid to the clinic I want to be sure the doctor is totally a health man. I don't want him to tell me about how I should not have a marital problem. I mean, I want him to mind <u>his</u> business-- to do <u>his</u> thing. There's something about the invasion of my life that bothers me when it's in the school too.*

* *I don't see it that way. I'm inclined to agree with the statement that probably many of the environments of many of our schools will be destroyed. I can see it. It's beginning to happen already down south for example.*

* *But the alternative need not be that extreme.*

* *No. That's what I'm trying to find. This period has elements of transition to it. The problem is, how do you train teachers within this sort of period? How do you train them in such a way that in many communities, at least in large cities, they are able to understand some of the demands being made on the school system and the necessity for working with the community and with parents. And they should appreciate that it is not such a bizarre idea that parents and community could have a say in the way a school is operated. If teachers are trained that way even with differeing opinions on what a reconstituted school should be, then the movement towards change in school systems will be made easier. So these elements of change in school systems and what the arguments are today, the pro's and con's, should enter into teacher*

training. Theories about education, one learning theory against another should, of course, be presented in teacher training. At the same time, one should present as objectively as one can, what the so-called social unrest is about in the school system--what the pro's and con's are about the different positions being taken by different people in education and outside of education. This would be in just the same way that social workers frequently discuss social policies with students and would bounce the idea of one change against the idea of another change. Why, in teacher training at this point, at this particular time, in this decade, could not that be presented to the teachers for debate. Learning theory they can discuss one way or the other. Why not the kinds of change that may not be impending.

** If the system is reconstituted then the teachers who have been trained either to go into a specific system or they leave it. If they leave it because they are still trained teachers they have to find another system to teach in. Sooner or later they'll run out of unreconstituted systems so the question arises, given the inevitability of a reconstitution, can they be trained in such a way that they can accommodate to it?

* Yes.

** Tell us how.

* Tell us more about the it.

** What it?

* What you mean by the reconstituted school, the school for the disadvantaged child.

* Let me say two things first. First, in response to your saying if you can't change, you can't have it. I say, "If you can't have it now then education will not exist as it is now and you can therefore stop talking about training teachers because there isn't going to be a need for them." That's number one. Number two, there is something else you said that I think is terribly important. You can't talk about a radical change in the educational system without talking about radical change in the economical system and social system and so forth and so on. Now, if these changes occur then I buy your transition formulation--because we would be moving towards something different in a variety of areas and you can't touch the educational system without the same time effecting

the economic, social, so forth and so on. Therefore, teacher training now, it seems to me, has to accede to all of this in the preparation of teachers and be ready to be a part in that transition and be prepared to see parents come in and say "It isn't going to be like this."

* *Sure.*

* *..... and the school is going to be open, not 9 to 5 only. And the community is going to tell you under what conditions that little bit of expertise--(and I say a little bit in terms of the total expertise), is going to be used.*

** *Now, let's look at it from the teacher's point of view. Let's go back to the one point I made earlier. The teacher starts off with the assumption that she has a mission and that she's competent to follow it. Now you are telling her that she is only entitled to a certain amount of autonomy within a very restricted area.*

* *Right.*

* *Right.*

** *O.K. Now how can you (a) keep her--because presumably you want her as an available resource and (b) how can you keep her respect for her own autonomy given the number of invasions she can anticipate?*

* *Because part of her expertise is her knowledge of the facts of life that you were just describing about community participation--that's part of her expertise aside from direct teaching.....*

** *Yes.*

* *Secondly, and illustratively, we've all been through this problem. So let's take the hardest analogy, let's take the brain surgeon. Nobody would argue that the brain surgeon does not have expertise. But what about the teacher? A lot of parents think they could teach but the brain surgeon--that's about the fanciest thing you could be--you can't do that with common sense! So even there, as an analogy, the brain surgeon will perform his expertise--which is brain surgery. Now, what does that expertise have to do with when the clinic hours are? Who decides the non-medical priorities? Who decides who is going to get his head operated on? Now you know, and we know, that those decisions aren't made on medical grounds. Why should the brain surgeon decide how much the fee will be? What's that got to do with brain surgery? But these things these guys have been doing for centuries. They've been*

making systemic decisions quite beyond their expertise. So if it's possible for the brain surgeon to stay busy enough just by being a brain surgeon, and it is apparent that the role of the community participant in the life of the hospital bed is paramount and doesn't tread on his territory one bit, then I think, if that's true about such an expert, one can make the translation to teaching.

** There are two points relevant to this which I think arise out of the mystique that education creates for itself. There is a delusion of grandeur which has been perpetuated in education, namely that the teacher is interested in the total education of the child--education is everything, and so by definition, everything is education.

* That's what worries me about your idea--exactly.

** The second one is, and I think it is a powerful one in the mid-20th century, the teacher cannot demonstrate knowledge, or expertise in any systematic way, so she cannot stand up and be perceived as an authority because she doesn't have the kind of empirical support from basic and pure research in education that she can call upon in the way that, for example, the brain surgeon can in his particular field. So I see that you would be making the teacher vulnerable on two counts; (i) you are violating her idealism, and (ii) you are threatening her because yo' are conceding that she is an expert, but she can't demonstrate it.

* In this particular respect, the teacher is no different from a social worker. I believe that one attribute of all professions is this kind of mish-mash professionalism, with peer judging and all the rigmarole that goes with it. But if you remove it you do need a certain sense of security. I think that in the training of social workers and teachers too, therefore, there is a kind of new sense of fraternity that has to be imparted. We are going to have to find our security not so much in having the 'annointments' but in service to the community and in recognizing that this is my role.

* Of a service guy?

* Right. Teachers in training and social workers, because there are parallels here, should be taught what we know about organization and organizational change and structure. I see that this is a hopeful thing in social work now that there are social workers coming out of the

school who no longer seem to need to have these old kinds of supports; who will go out and work for the community.

* *And they feel themselves to be lucky if the community comes in and participates.*

* *That's right.*

* *They get their security from that narrow bit of expertise. I guess teacher training now must help teachers get rid of this mystique. You see, I'm not prepared to say that the teacher is everything. But the teacher has to be helped in the training process just as the social worker is. You know, social workers used to think too that they could order everybody's life. They could take a problem and from that they could get into all kinds of deeper problems. Now they are beginning to see, I hope, that they can only take care of a <u>piece</u> of the problem which is a <u>piece</u> of the person's life and they can't <u>even</u> take responsibility for that.*

* *When I was reading in the educational field, somewhere in the 50's, I went delving in the school of education. I told them I was interested in community participation in schools. They did produce books for me that dealt with community participation. There's an early history of it, in the 20's. So actually, when you examine the education field per se, you find textbooks and chapters dealing with that. Now how come it was there but only pro forma? It should be possible to re-introduce the idea into education but not, of course, just a bland description of what it was like in the 20's and 30's.*

** *But worse still, it mustn't just revert to a philosophical discussion, in particular dealing with Dewey's position. He was advocating this kind of development but at the mystique level. You had to 'believe' in it. It wasn't concerned with what you are going to do, how you are going to do things, or manipulate it or organize it. You are right, the doctrine is there but my fear is that education will accept the doctrine and feel, misguidedly, that because their intentions are pure their actions will therefore be good.*

* *I think that student teachers, like students of anything, have to be exposed to areas of controversy so they will formulate their own doctrines. You don't get it by injection. You know there was a beautiful article, two years ago, by Richard Goodwin (he was a Kennedy*

speach writer in New York). It was called the "Source of the Public's Unhappiness". It's one of those beautiful things about alienation and bigness, and that sense of lack of participation of all of us, not just disadvantaged people--like nobody participating when the subway fares went up and that's part of the reason why they can't get people to accept it. Now it seems to me that could be given to teachers as an example--not as a doctrine.

** Can I make a point? If you prepare teachers like this and even if you do get teachers to accept it and feel comfortable with it, even so, when the community comes to the teacher and says do this and do that, do the other thing, the expectations are likely to be unrealistic. So the teacher has to start reeducating the community into understanding why she can do this and can't do that.

* Where's your principal, where's your board, where are your other community people. I mean, the teacher should not be alone.

* Another good article recently in "Public Interest" dealing with New York City and its problems made the point that it isn't right to say that people lack participation. The problem is that there is more participation than ever. Certainly in the new neighborhoods you feel that so keenly. There are such divergent communities that they are pulling in opposite directions on any issue you want. You know, whether it's to build a fire house or a park, people just cannot agree. It's so hard to get people who share large objectives even, to get together on any one plan. So that when we talk of the teachers, we are on the right track in the notion that they should be exposed to what the climate is and what the different issues are. But I think there is another real problem, once you get out into it. The acts of participation of divergent groups in the community make it very hard. I don't know the answer to this one at all--how you can deal with them so that you can move forward.....

* As I see it, they run into a series of community expectations that are divergent.

* You know, the teacher isn't the whole school. Until we clearly help teachers to find their role in that system we haven't done the job. We have talked as if the school and the teacher were synonymous. Now we are adding a whole lot of other built-in roles for the teacher. I

think her sanction will come from something else--in the community--that says this is what you do and we are going to have other people to do this and this in the system. They have principals, supervisors and all that but she seems to be the school. I want to define, as I do for social workers, the very small piece of functioning where she can claim expertise and get security from that. And I would exclude from the role what the sociologist does and what the economist does (you know, in social work we have tried to be all of them incidentally).....

* *Haven.. tried to be brain surgeons!*

** *If you are now going to define the teacher's role womewhat narrowly, would you care to suggest some parameters.*

* *Let's start from the beginning. Surely the teacher is responsible for the classroom. I mean could we agree on that? I mean, she's responsbile for what happens in the class room. Whether she uses para-professionals or mothers from the community to help her is irrelevant to that point, she is still responsible for what happens in that class-room.*

** *Can I talk about that a little. It was in the 1930's that an educational sociologist by the name of Waller developed the thesis that the school is in a perilous state of equilibrium, with revolt incipient--the students against the teachers and the teachers against other segments of the society as well. That sort of idea has been reiterated ever since. Do you think even if responsibility is given to the teacher for what happens in the classroom, in many ways she is starting behind scratch in that her students arrive with preconceptions and attitudes that are quite antithetical to her work?*

* *I'm not saying she's responsible for the world. Nor is she personally or professionally responsible for the disadvantagedness of the children who come. All I'm starting with was what I thought was basic. That was, that first we specify the classroom responsibility, and after that we then fan it out and see where else a teacher might go. But it seems to me that the one place where she is, herself, master professionally, is within the classroom.*

* *That's true.*

* *Would this help to clarify the idea? Actually she is responsible for creating within that classroom the kind of atmosphere, the kind of*

climate, where children can learn. She is responsible for the development of the kind of climate that will permit the kind of opportunities available to be appreciated.

* *That's icing on the cake. She's also responsible if the class falls apart. She's not only responsible for good, she's responsible for the bad.*

* *You can't say she's not responsible because.....*

* *But the kids may come in bringing certain anti-teacher or anti-school impedimenta to learning. If we started from that, then I would say that you can't teach people to teach--because that's their job to work with the people who come into the classroom.....*

* *It seems to me that what we have been talking about thus far would only have her carry responsibility for what goes on in the classroom that is learning experience. This is her thing. She's got all these insights and all these things that we've been putting into teacher training. She comes equipped. This is her total expertise and she uses it to carry out her responsibility for what happens in that classroom.*

* *If she knows she's responsible and she's accountable, then maybe her messianic complex could get a little qualified but she'll know from the evidence from her studies and from experience, that she cannot for example, shame a 13 year old boy into something and not expect repercussions. I mean that's her problem. If she knows she's accountable, then she damn well better teach a decent class.*

** *O.K. If she's responsible, and I'll accept that now, then she has to demonstrate her expertise in, as it were, influencing the situation. It doesn't have to be blatant manipulation. It can be quiet manipulation. But somehow or other she exerts power over the situation through her authority. Now this is not ascribed authority, it is authority of expertise, because she knows how to do it. Question; are there situations that come in disadvantaged classrooms that you have peculiar knowledge about so that teachers can come to view the situation differently from the characteristic way they do?*

* *More than that. Kenneth Clark describes the teacher who looks at the children and makes the assumption that they cannot learn, so she does not have to call on her expertise. She does not assume*

responsibility for what happens in that classroom because she has already said that nothing can happen there with these children.

* *We used to have an expression in case work, which is part of social work, when clients failed to keep appointments. We used to say; "Case closed, client uncooperative". That's the original cop-out, you know. And only when a profession gets over that idea that when the client fails there's something worng with him, and comes to appreciate that there's something wrong with what you've tried to do to him, does it really come of age. When you get over that, you are really on the way to being a profession.*

* *In my experience in group work--I've worked on the East side and in the Pittsburgh district--I have noticed that there is some carry-over from group work to the classroom. There are some insights to be had from group dynamics in working with the so-called disadvantaged child. For example, it's obvious that when working with a group it is a very good idea to keep your eye open among peers for the natural leaders.....*

* *And learn not to see everything.*

* *Yes. You could work with that to begin with, to develop relationship with the natural leaders in the development of a group. Now, probably in classrooms (I don't know, I haven't really tried to make the transition), you would probably find with disadvantageds, and probably in the middle class also, these leaders crop up. Teachers should understand what basis they have for exercising their leadership, find qualities that they have, that make them acceptable as leaders to the others. They ought to be able to exploit and use it for a constructive purpose, no matter what happens to be the basis of their authority. There is some good that could come out of it, that could be used skillfully. Another thing I've noticed in particular--I've been slammed up against the wall more than once when I was young, particularly when I reached for the telephone to call the police--that is how teachers can handle the threat of physical attack. I would be willing to say that as a young man I probably bungled somewhere to reach that point. Teachers are worried about physical aggression--how to understand the basis of physical aggression and be able to handle it would be valuable. They have to know how to explain it, to arrive at*

the 'why'. You can't just write out a prescription--you have to have the reason. Then there's an art to using your understanding and knowledge to indicate what to do.

* *Are you talking about elementary schools primarily or doesn't it matter?*

** *It really doesn't matter. In fact, I have the sneaking suspicion that when we're talking about disadvantage it doesn't matter either. I think we are talking about education--what we are saying applies right across the board. Disadvantage is a convenient focus for us at the moment.*

* *Maybe what you say should be true for all education. However, I hope that we might try to tease out later where there are differences for the quote 'disadvantaged'. Somewhere along the line I would like to talk about minority disadvantage because I think there might be some difference there, and some requirements of inputs for teaching there that are special and unique. Maybe they aren't.....*

* *There are. As far as the economic level is concerned. You know the eleven-plus exam for entry to secondary school in England? I have a friend who lives in England and who had twin children who had to take the eleven-plus. Well, one twin made it and one twin didn't. So at 11 it was virtually decided whether or not she was going to go to the university. And yet both of her children, although one went to technical school and one went to grammar school, were advantaged. There were still other kids who didn't make it at all, in a way. They never had the right parental back-up. There never were any books at home and so on. I mean, if you're going to get right down to what a disadvantaged child has, it's like that.*

* *That's just exactly what I was thinking in specific relationship to economic disadvantage. If you observe slow, pre-school children growing up in a home where there is a limited number of children and see how the mother and father apply their vocabulary, then you observe children from a home where the mother has no time to talk to the infant; when you encounter these same youngsters in a group at a settlement home for example, certain differences are quite apparent. One of the remarkable things I think the teacher of disadvantaged children has to deal with is the paucity of the children's vocabulary. I don't think*

we realize how handy it is to have the abstract words to apply to feeling states or social phenomena.

* *You know I think we are on rather dangerous ground. I think this is a real obstacle to encounter. If you have a vocabulary and if you deal with people who do not, there is, to put it mildly, a communication problem.*

** *In effect though, the judgement you are making is really whether one language performance is more useful than another. Because we've completed the linguistic consortium, I'm going to digress a minute. The linguists argue that the underprivileged child comes to school with a kind of communiation system, a kind of language that is very functional for him.....*

* *Right.*

** *... And what the teachers don't appreciate is the functionality of that language for the disadvantaged child. Now, maybe if we start to investigate their particular language, we will find a means of communication about which the so-called privileged are underprivileged.*

* *I think you're absolutely right and if I'm ever bothered about my own middle class position it's when I walk through Central Harlem and I hear kids talking and using language that for me at 17, 18 and at my present age is pure obscenity. Yet this is the everyday medium of communication. I was touring the suburb two weeks ago, and there was this six foot guy and another one on the bus going to work. I couldn't help hearing their conversation. I was really trying to read the New York Times. While reading it, from 96th Street up to 42nd I counted the number of times that 'm-f' was used. What I finally deduced was that the subject of every sentence was 'm-f'--no matter what the subject was or what the predicate was. And I thought, no, this man isn't talking obscenity at all.....*

* *That's right.*

* *.....this man is using the only communication he knows.*

* *..... and the child too. The children on the street are doing this. You know this word MAN. Every sentence beings, MAN this MAN that. Is this peculiar to the disadvantaged child?*

** *No, it's just a language feature. There are many others that are similar. For example, in New Zealand it is characteristic to end questions*

with an 'eh'. "Shall we go to the movies, eh?" Now, so what? It just happens to be a language ritual that is followed. And it is quite proper and quite legitimate.

* But how long has that been in existence?

** I guess at least 80 years.

* But you see, 'm-f' hasn't been in the disadvantaged community long enough for people to understand its ritualistic character.

* When we had our student riots two years ago, the students were a little wild and I got a term paper--first time in my life and I know it won't be the last time--that had the title "Child Welfare in the United States or Up Against the Wall 'M.F.'" You know, he's right too.

* On the paper?

* Yeah, the title of the paper. So I mean, like that's different, man!

* Let me move from what is a cultural phenomenon and what I believe is an economic phenomenon too, to the program Sesame Street. It's directed to pre-school children as an aid to learning.

* Every day?

* Yes, every day. But when you ask people who run day-care centers for poor kids, and others who run day-care centers for advantaged kids, you find that the more advantaged kids thought Sesame Street quite dull because they already knew their numbers and the alphabet. But the kids from Henry Street Day Care Center eat it up because this is all news to them. Now, when those youngsters get into first grade there is a difference that the teacher has to contend with because these uncharacteristic experiences they had, have an effect on their vocabulary. I think this is very important.

* I think it would be wrong to try to get the teachers to speak the languages.

* To start talking the lingo is phoney.

* The rationalisation is that in order to have rapport they have to take on the mannerisms of speech and dress of the people they are teaching.

* I agree that's faulty reasoning.

* But if you get more teachers coming out of where these kids come from.....

* That's a very good thing.

** The linguists agree with you. They think that the teachers should be exposed to non-standard English in a variety of forms, they should be acceptant of it but to learn it goes beyond necessity.

* I think that if we get more teachers coming out of urban underprivilege you have to make damn sure that in the process of transition they do not reject the culture--that you don't do something to them in the training process that denudes them of what they have in them that is so important to take back.

* Yes, that's a very subtle point.

** But one wonders why they come out. Are they rejecting it <u>when</u> they come out?

* They've been given an opportunity they never had before. All right, so it means more money but that doesn't mean you have to do what social work used to do, you know, make them all over in the 'proper' image.

* There was a guy who came from Moody Street to register for our school, and he had his long hair and his hat like Easy Rider and he was absolutely the most marvellous, perfect example of a love child I had ever seen. Now, we have got so used to it we finally have learned not to try to remake these people.

* I have a marvellous example I want to give. A few years ago, working with about ten high school drop-outs. One day I got talking to one of them and I asked him, "Why did you drop-out from high school?" He told me, "It was easy". Apparently one day he said to the teacher, "teach me how to gamble". This was in class, during algebra, and she was horrified. She said, "teach you to gamble, I can't teach you how to gamble, get out of here". And after that she just rode his back. So he explained to her that he had to learn how to gamble because where he lived, in order to make out with the boys he <u>had</u> to know how to gamble. But she wouldn't teach him and she just disapproved of him. So he quit school.

* The fact of the matter is that the teacher needs to be much more oriented to what is going on in the community. And you need to get this through into the training of the teacher. She needs not only to be sensitive but also to participate in the community so she really knows about this. That's one part of it. The other part of it is to train

the teacher as a professional person to be as creative and imaginative as she can in order to pick up on what the youngsters are saying, and what they want to get. She needs to be able to figure out a way of tuning into their concerns and their interests and at the same time get at what it is she thinks they should learn in her class.

*** There's a problem however, which needs a little bit of clarification. That is, we still see the teacher as the expert in the classroom situation--that's her particular domain. But you also suggested that she should be community oriented, community sensitive, community sympathic. Now, (a) she should be that as a human being because that's the way human beings ought to be, and (b) she should also do it on the grounds that he can also use this information to help his expertise in the classroom situation.*

* *Sure.*

* *This is why I want at some point to narrow this down to specific disadvantaged minorities because I keep wondering for example, how will teachers in Central Harlem, New York, ever relate to students in teaching History, Social Studies, in terms of the teacher's perception of, let's say, Adam Powell--and the pupil's perception of Adam Powell. My God, how the teacher must turn-off those kids, you know, in terms of what she either says about Adam Powell or what she fails to say. Now, how is she going to learn about what the community perception (and I say community quite deliberately) of Adam Powell is in spite of what the New York Times says, etc., etc., etc. How does she learn <u>that</u>?*

* *If I were a teacher in a classroom and I only knew about Adam Powell what I read in the newspapers, and I'm in the classroom and discussion comes up about Adam Powell, I would let the students tell me.*

* *You won't get it.*

* *'But you can get it.*

* *Let me finish my piece. Make my point. As a teacher in the graduate school of social work with students, I have tutorials. And the whole block-wide relationship is there. We had militants in the school, gung-ho militants. I sit there and they say things I don't even understand.*

* *Let me take back what I said about you won't get it. You won't get it <u>unless</u> you've created what you apparently have in your group.*

They trust you.

* *O.K. They trust me--it took a year. It was able to be done. I don't want to buy the argument that I can't do it.*

* *O.K.*

* *How you got to be trusted is probably what needs to get into teacher training.*

** *Yes please.*

* *You've got to be trustworthy. But one of the things that I think could be misconstrued is this manipulation idea--the idea of manipulating teachers to get them to do right. I don't think that's the way it should be done with teachers any more than it should be done that way with students. Now, maybe it has to do with the selection process or maybe it has to do with the things we expose them to. Maybe we should say, "Look kids, this is the way it is--this is a demand of this system. This is our announced goal; that kids are supposed to learn and be happy in the classroom, O.K.? That's it. If you don't like it, leave now". You know, something a little softer than that. But I think we <u>do</u> have to assume some valued things. For example, I don't think you can <u>teach</u> a teacher to handle a dissident group. You can't teach anyone how to handle a bunch of activist students unless he is really trustworthy. Otherwise it's manipulation and I can't stand that. The fact that they trust him is not for any reason other than because he is trustworthy--no matter what he said or did.*

* *Let me get to this concept of trustworthiness from a personal anecdote. It came about through a series of things. At first the group was pretty stand-offish. Then we had to raise money in six weeks. If we didn't get the money some students (black ones) were not going to be admitted. Right? So how was trustworthiness gained? By putting-out, day in and day out on this campaign for funds. I was bogged down with two students. But you could see a decline of the stand-offishness at the point where I was able to finally get angry at doing my part. And I said, "It's a goddamn one way street, you're not telling me anything". I yelled that too. And they then came back at me. That started progress. But the trustworthiness came from what they saw that I was doing.*

* *That's right.*

* ..... They could see what the hell I was doing.

* But you're making my point. You could stand on your head but if you're not real, and if you're not a real trustworthy person.....

* This is the point I'm driving at. The point was that they identified me as being, in that particular action, on their side. That's the fundamental psychological point of trustworthiness.

* You can be not on their side and be a trustworthy enemy.

* You haven't been struck yet. When our students were on strike and I went up where the police were and as I went by, one of the students said "Hi!", and I had had it by then. We had been out about three weeks. We had been locked out. So I went over to her and I said, "I've had you! With "hello and we're all friends and all that." I haven't been in my office for three weeks. Who in the hell do you think you are, keeping me out. I am being kept from writing your reference. I mean, this isn't the 1930's. I'm not the boss making money from you!" And the big argument was around the street. The veins are sticking out, and I was just, oh furious about it and I said, "I've had it after these three weeks!" Do you know what they did? They said, "Beautiful, beautiful, what a confrontation, you were just great."

* About this trustworthiness and the sense of the development of a relationship--I think, maybe psychologists might think I'm wrong, but at some time in the relationship of teacher and student the student has to somehow get conveyed to him that the teacher is really with him--on his side.

* I find it very difficult to relate what you are saying with the situation I know. Let me tell you. We had a terrible teachers' strike in New York City. During the strike things were very heated in the neighborhood where I worked and some teacher came in--a person maybe twenty years my junior. She wasn't young but you would think she would be with us. And she stood at the office and looked at the sign that said "black is beautiful" and she says to me, "Why don't you say white is beautiful!" And that woman, how could I begin to explain to her why it didn't say white is beautiful.

* Why didn't you have a sign that said white is beautiful?

* ..... and how do you know that black is beautiful?

It's all right, I'm just saying that Jewish is gorgeous!

* *This is part of what I'm saying. You know, you have a sign up, let's say, "white-black is beautiful" and someone says to you; "What do you know about black?", and "How dare you say black is beautiful because you don't even know what I mean when I say black!" You know? Now the teacher who says "I am with you....." They don't want you to be with them--they want you to be honest. They want you to be honest to the point of saying, "I don't know what it means to be black, and therefore I'm not going to put on my wall 'black is beautiful' because I don't know what it is". Now the minute you communicate that to a student, you are so real that you have communicated trustworthiness. And this is where I think that, certainly in the minority communities, the pseudo liberals, and pseudo liberal teachers are making huge mistakes. He or she is not coming through because when black or Puerto Rican students say you don't know, they try to protest that they do.*

* *I don't really think that the problem is the pseudo liberal teacher. This teacher I was talking about was one of what seemed to be hundreds going on strike. This was a white teacher perceiving a sign on a black man's wall and she doesn't even comprehend. I mean, she was just so far out of it.*

* *Yes, but teachers can be trained to convey that they are on the side of the student. The student has to feel that that teacher wants him to learn--wants, really wants, him to learn. In that sense, he is on his side. Now, it's easy to say that the problem is how does the student know that that is so. It's not the verbalizing usually. You can say almost anything to people if you have a relationship that works well. It's the actions that count. If you do something that's consistent with what you said, that's how trustworthiness grows up. In that sense you become predictable to that student. And he understands that you really want to teach, you really want him to learn. That means that from that flows a lot of creative ways of teaching and from that very impetus flows all sorts of ideas and all sorts of techniques that come out most naturally when the student and teacher feel on the same side of things. All sorts of imaginative ideas can come out. Teachers can throw away textbooks. Let them create their own books.*

** *Let me put forward a thesis--that, on second thoughts, may not*

be a thesis at all. Let's assume that individuals have a propensity for loving--O.K.? They have a propensity for giving love and getting love. Now, I would argue that students often come to feel that they are not getting love and that they are being de-humanized in the sense that they are being regarded as ciphers. In other words, their essential humanness has not been recognized. Now, I think that under these circumstances they tend to give back what they are getting and so they tend to de-humanize others and treat them as if in fact they are not human. Now I think that when you got angry with your students you demonstrated your humanness, and I think that what happened in your particular situation was that the students could make the jump and see that here was another human being demonstrating exactly the kind of distress that they knew. You had cleared away the barrier for exchanging affect. I think that this ties up with the idea of sensitivity to other people so that in fact one can demonstrate a willingness to exchange feelings--whether in fact you're trustworthy or not. I'm sure that you can point to friends who you love and who you are quite prepared to accept despite their untrustworthiness and their unreliability and that they don't do the things they say they will do and so on.

* I wouldn't have any friends if I didn't!

** Now I think that in teacher training, teachers have been nurtured on the idea of the necessity to be nice people--and to give love. But they come to do the very things you are inveighing against. They believe that this is just a matter of ritual. So they smile in the 'right' places. And they play the Skinner game and give rewards at regular intervals and say "very good" (whether it is good or not). And at this point they think they are human beings. But in fact, they're not.

* I would like to emphasize this point, because I think what we're saying is that this kind of experience is not just an intellectual one but it is part activity. What you do is what really tells me what you think. It tells me that you're not just saying it to be nice or smart or so on but that you are really involved in something that is significant to me.

** Can I cite an example from some of my own research. We took video-

tapes of teachers in classrooms. One particular teacher in a wealthy area of St. Louis had got an award from Yale for being one of the five best teachers in the country. Quite by change we took tapes of his teaching. He was teaching high school mathematics, and it was obvious that the kids delighted in being in his class. But when we talked to him afterwards and asked the standard questions, he said; "I don't give a damn about their psyches, I don't care if they are emotionally disturbed. I'm not really worried about their background. All I'm really concerned with is that they think mathematically." And it was obvious from the way that he taught that he got inside their minds, he got at the way they were thinking so that he began to maneuver and manipulate their intellectual processes. Now, I think that in one way he was showing a kind of concern for them, though it wasn't through the conventional methods of saintliness and succorance and all that jazz. So it seems to me that you can demonstrate concern or, if you like, a degree of empathy in a variety of ways--not just solely by the conventional--"let's all be sweetness and light" etc. Now, would you buy this?

* Yes.

** All right, would you also be willing to argue that some kids in coming to school from disadvantaged areas are quite resistent to the idea of accepting some kinds of affect?

* Yes. Going back to what I tried to say earlier about a relationship and the capacity of individuals to accept it and to use it. Let me start this way by saying that the first relationship experience the child has is with his parents and then it widens to the family and so on. Now in many of the disadvantaged communities the emotional climate is ruptured--is unhealthy. So if the child has had little or no experience in giving love and accepting love, the teacher has to be prepared for it and accept the fact that these kids aren't prepared to accept it. Now what do you put in the teacher's armament that helps her to accept that this kid over there has never had the experience of giving or receiving of live. The teacher needs to know that he's going to react, and react in a very negative way, in a very destructive way. She has to have that equipment built in.

* And she has to have her needs met too, in other places.

* *All right, all right, I agree.*

* *That's part of the problem, she imagines that she's got to have the kids love her.*

** *You must have situations like this in social work, what do you do?*

* *We tell them to go out and get their needs met--and don't do it in office hours. We tell them to go out and get some experience. Sometimes they think we mean have a worldly experience and what we are really saying is, go out and have a <u>love</u> experience.*

* *That's one of the self-awareness things we have to teach students--one of the things which we take the responsibility to teach. They can't do that sort of thing on our clients' time.*

** *You know, now that we have got this into the record, despite the casual way you dealt with it, it is sheer and utter heresy as far as education is concerned. Pure heresy!*

* *Sheer what?*

** *Heresy. Nowbody would possibly contemplate saying anything like that--how could you?*

* *Like what?*

** *Like go out and get your gratification <u>outside</u> your vocation.*

* *Then they must have very sexy classrooms!!*

** *How can you <u>talk</u> about such a thing? I'm caricaturing my reaction but to the best of my knowledge one of education's unquestioned credos is, love one's job and one's pupils.*

* *You mean doctors couldn't work with people they didn't like? In a way that's the hallmark of a profession--to have some objectivity from your own life.*

** *Stay with this a little bit, because teachers have got to like their kids. They're told they have to like their kids and if they don't like their kids, they ought to feel as guilty as hell about it!*

* *They can like their kids but they can't expect that their kids are going to like them back.*

** *Suppose they don't like their kids.*

* *They have to teach them anyway and in a liking way.*

** *Right! Does that mean now that they are manipulating?*

* *No.*

* *What do you mean when you say they don't like the kids? If they*

don't like the kid, I would want to know why they don't. Don't they like red hair?

* *Behavior?*

* *..... or speach, or color, or cleanliness? But just not liking the kids--no. I don't like everybody. I know I'm happy and I know I'm not guilty about not liking everybody, but I accept everybody.*

* *And you can work with anybody, or else you are not professional. And, believe me, I've seen him with the worst dregs in society.....*

* *That's the sort of objectivity that needs to be built into teacher training.*

* *I wonder if it isn't a matter of giving them permission to have different feelings. They don't always have to be modest, they don't have to be sweet. A lot of teachers I have observed have a sort of sacramental quality about them. Part of teacher training should be to let them know that they don't come on like that. They should be real. They should accept the fact that people can get your goat.*

* *A supervisor once said to me that one of the ways to get over this problem of not liking all your clients (it's not just with manipulation) is that you have to hate the problem so much that you can't help but listen to the client. The teacher has to hate ignorance so much that their liking for the person becomes almost irrelevant--because she wants so much for the kid to learn.*

** *With your permission, can I get you to recapitulate the point at lunch when you were developing the thesis that there wasn't much difference between the problem of training of teachers and the problem of training social workers.*

* *Yes, I think someone was trying to make a distinction between the training of teachers and the training of social workers in that teachers would be working with children with respect to their whole life whereas social workers were concerned with a defined client and an immediate pathology. Then the whole discussion came about as a result of the matter of whether participation of the student teacher and the student social worker is an education experience. And I was opting for it being an educational experience whatever else it is. Then he came up with this formulation and the argument that therefore, this is not the function of the teacher. So the end products are*

different. Then I said that I saw it as an educational process for both because the teacher is being trained to work in a system and relate to a hierarchy--principal, supvervisor, Board of Education, and heavens know what. The educational experience of being part of the administration of a school of education contributes to the growth of that person's ability and her competence to fit into and be creative in that system. And that is, I said, no different (and this is where I differend with him) from the social worker, who is also part of a system. The social worker is not quote "autonomous"--except those who are in private practice. I said some other things about the fact that the social worker too must fit into a system and know how to relate to the structure, and to know how to attempt to effect change in the structure. Therefore, the educational experience of a student social worker, a student in school social work, in going through the government process in the university or school has this kind of carry-over. To this extent I do not see a difference between the student social worker and the student teacher.

** *Would it be right for me to say that the social worker is also manipulating--you know, in the nicest possible way--according to an end that that social worker thinks is good in that particular case.*

* *Manipulating who?*

** *Manipulating the client.*

* *They do, but that's not the value.*

** *Well, are you suggesting that he should be completely Rogerian?*

* *No.*

** *But as soon as you depart from a Rogerian position, don't you become a manipulator?*

* *No. Theoretically at least not in case work--and I think it's all right to say in practice too. Take that example of the unmarried mother and the problem of giving away her child (which is a typical example of a decision that has to be made). Now while the social worker might think she or he knows what's best, Rogerian passivity wouldn't be very helpful. Manipulation wouldn't be very helpful either. I mean, it would not only be wrong but it wouldn't be helpful. So the middle thing and the model thing to do, that is taught all the time, is that the practitioner would help the unwedded mother see the alternatives if*

she were to do this and then to help her to do one of those two things. There are very few instances; among them perhaps a guy standing on a ledge about to jump off; where the social worker decides for the person what is best for him.

** *I wouldn't want to dwell on this because it may subvert us. But wouldn't you think however, that the social worker does manipulate the situation very subtly.....*

* *I'm sure they do.*

** *..... by phrasing questions, by the selection of questions, 3 even by asking questions.....*

* *They do, but they shouldn't. I'm sure they do.*

** *This is the difference with teachers because the teacher is quite sure she should manipulate. You know, 'two and two are four' just isn't negotiable.*

* *I think a more important point to me, for our purpose, is that if the teacher does it, there is no value conflict. When a social worker does it, there is.*

* *What do you mean?*

** *Well, that kid has definitely got to learn that two and two are four. He's got to understand. He's got to be manipulated in such a way that he comes to that conclusion and that conclusion only.*

* *Well, I wonder if some qualifications shouldn't be made about the social worker's practice. I'm not on very good grounds. I don't know too much about case work. But isn't it true that a social case worker comes to certain conclusions after assessing with the client (because that social worker is a value carrier and a community representative and is not functioning as an entrepreneur, but is representing a societal value and goal) then attempts subtly, non-directly (I don't care how you put it) to help that client sit down and make choices under the influence of the weight of the social worker as the societal interpreter.*

* *I would say absolutely no. I would say that the weight is on the side of reality. That's the thing the social worker is supposed to sell.*

** *Reality?*

* *Reality, and I mean that very concretely. When a sixteen year*

old kid says; "I want to keep my baby" the social worker may think "good idea". (In fact, a lot of social workers do think, "good idea"). But it's irrelevant what they think. But what they ought to think about is what this kid's situation is. Sometimes it's a realistic possibility--she has a mother at home, etc. etc. If it isn't, then that's the reality she has to be able to face.

** Question--is the social worker's concern then with reducing every problem to a logical solution?

* That would be an ideal that we could hardly hope to reach. It sure would be nice to have logical solutions. I don't think there are many logical solutions. Most people don't look at reality through clear eye glasses. If social workers sell or should sell anything, in my view, they should sell the realistic possibilities available, and help the client to look at them more clearly. I'm talking out of lingo but help the client look at the realistic possibilities.

** Realistic possibilities as defined by?

* The client and worker and life.

** And life!

* Of course.

** That's what has a manipulative tinge to it.

* I don't think it's manipulative. It's manipulation only, it seems to me with a capital 'm'.

* I think maybe there's a way out of this. What, after all, do we mean by manipulation. Manipulation is something that would appear to me to mean using people for ends of which they are not aware.

* Very good.

* Now, if we start with a teacher who is teaching 'two plus two'--the students know it is for them.

* The kid makes a contract when he comes into the classroom.

* Yes, that's a contract. So it means that what's being done is known. What we object to in social work manipulation, as far as I understand it, is the using of people for ends they are not aware of.

** I like that. Now, as far as the teacher is concerned, when she gets into a domain like social studies where in fact the facts reflect value judgements, beliefs and opinions.....

* What's manipulative about that?

** You get to be told what to believe by the teacher.

* *Yes, but then you have to define education to me differently. If education is viewed as a not just social control but as indoctrination then you and I are talking about two different trolley tracks. Or as one of my colleagues says, that's a horse of a different garage. We were talking about Abraham Lincoln at lunch and I just learned last year that he isn't the hero that we were taught to believe he was--because we were mistraught history. We should have been taught the facts of history and the proper frame of reference to bring to evaluate those facts. That to me is education. I don't want any stupid teacher teaching me what to believe. That's not education. That's immoral.*

** *Educationists subscribe to the cliche that education is concerned with perpetuating society's values.*

* *Which are?*

** *Whatever values the teacher happens to hold.*

* *See what I mean? In a multi-cultural society whose values are they going to be?*

** *O.K.*

* *But because we are a heterogeneous society and with heterogeneous values that frequently clash with each other, it's important for social workers and teachers to exhibit the alternatives.*

* *Right.*

* *And it's a healthy thing it is heterogeneous. Otherwise we'd all be brainwashed.*

* *You know, there was a movement in education in the late 40's, late 30's which may be alive, I don't know. All the talk then was about education for democracy. Someone posited the thesis that education at the elementary and high school level should grow from society's definition of the kind of society it wanted and not the kind of leading out that you were talking about--actually indoctrinate for that kind of society. He said that the ills of our society are going to continue to multiply unless we do that. Now, how much of that is still part of the philosophy of training teachers?*

* *I believe, even in Sweden, a single-culture like Sweden, where 98% of the people are Lutheran and white, even there (conceding how advanced Sweden is in many ways) they probably lead into ideas. They don't indoctrinate though they have more right to indoctrinate because they*

have such a single, homogeneous society.

* *One of the things that concerns me, is that we talk about society and this is an abstraction. Just what do we have in mind? Who is the society? Who are the value-ridden people? Who influences the society? Where are they? Are they the property people? Are they the political people? Are they the little people, the middle people--all right, are they the silent majority?*

* *..... which bit of the silent majority? Which of the many underprivileged groups? I think we are right back to what you said earlier.*

* *It seems to me with the community, both in social work and in education we have got a long way to go to really understand what we mean by community. We say glibly, community this, community that--and the teacher should know about the community, the social worker should know about the community. Well, what is the community? Is it particular people? Or rather, is it not a sense that is a feeling about a part of a group of people, or whoever happens to be in the ascendancy in the leadership. And it decides certain kinds of values and because of that, we say that's it. But is it really it? Does the ghetto community, the poor community have any input to make and does it make it. I have the feeling that they do have some input to offer but we are not perceptively receiving these kinds of inputs. For example, if you go down some streets in Washington, you see all the garbage and the waste there. No-one picks up day after day. People kind of opt out--why?*

* *Following up on what you say, as far as I can understand, what the education systems are aiming at in their value outlook, at least in the elementary and secondary school, is roughtly for the middle class. They would want to see the disadvantaged embrace middle class values.*

* *That's easier for themselves.*

* *Easier for themselves and easier for society--easier all around. So when a teacher sees a student bahave in a particular sort of way, the intent of that teacher is to bring that student along to accept certain kinds of middle class values. Now, you couldn't convince me that because it is middle class, that it is ipso facto bad.*

* *Or that it is good.*

* O.K. I'm just trying to accent another part of the argument. That's the intent of any educational system in any society so to speak--the dominant values are the ones with which a student is going to be taught. Now, what we are saying particularly in this country today is that some of these, not all, some of these middle class values, to use the jargon, are dysfunctional, they're no good. There are other values in society that could be equally reflected when we teach. That's where our argument is. What are the other values? And they should be presented in teacher training so that the teachers can be open-minded.

* ..... and perhaps the values this country is moving toward and its style of life, its outlook, so that they should be open-minded, able to look at the pro's and con's of it. It would have to be with students at the proper age (I don't think all students can engage in this sort of discussion.) A country, if it is to survive, has to seek a consensus in its population. In that sense, you can't escape a certain amount of indoctrination.

** There is a point though. Remember right at the beginning you said that education should be sure that it adopts the most parsimonious approach that it can. Now obviously, if everybody is going to discuss all possible alternative values all the time, you're going to run into the problem of, as it were, re-inventing the wheel, aren't you?

* That may be true. But they say that even scientists could have a hot discussion about whether two and two equals four. How much higher discussion could one have about goods or about values. It seems to me that it's just impossible to teach what is good and what is bad. Gordon Hamilton said, "You can't teach values, only teach about them."

* You know, I think that this is a much more thorny problem in education somehow than it is to the social worker. Later on you can discuss these differential values but that's really too late. In job training, the business in which I am very much involved, for example, the whole attitude toward work and getting there on time, accepting bosses, is a valued mode of behavior that just has to be learned. It doesn't seem to me that the teacher <u>can</u> be completely open. These values are functional. You know, it's a terrible risk if you say, well, you can go either way.....

* But then I think that is a dodge when you say, if the teacher

perceives the reality, she knows these kids are going to have to work, so she starts on it in grade one. It still is indoctrination. Now, when you take a little more abstract level, for example the community control issue, with community control in New York City, the viewpoint in the Bayside toward race is going to be very different from Harlem's, and do we really want children indoctrinated to be racist, if that is the dominating view, or do we want the teacher to be completely open.

* *I agree.*

* *So the teacher does indoctrinate?*

* *But if you have to re-define each time, you do re-invent the wheel. But you don't have to do that either, when there is consensus about values, and priorities and when all parts of the population have had a part in the input of that consensus. But what we have now, and this is where the problem stands, the values we are talking about are middle class values, we are talking about white values in the American society. But blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos and American Indians never have had an input and part of the conflict now is that those minorities are saying "Hold up", we want a piece of the action. They do not say that they have to substitute their values for our values, but they do want their values taken into consideration.*

* *The definition of values as we see them.....*

* *.....as we see them. Then you come up with something that it is not left open for that teacher to decide. But in a pluralistic society the inputs have to come from all the plurals.*

** *In view of the fact that there is quite a marked hiatus between youth and age, however, and given the fact that education is concerned with youth, and given the immense size of this country, don't you think that you're still going to inherit a situation where youth will feel that they are not involved in the value consensus anyway.*

* *Actually, realistically and empirically there <u>is</u> input in some areas although it is not having too much effect at the present time. But nevertheless there is evidence of values being transmuted and changed today. Let's take another example; I could go on and on, and exhibit how the value behavior of adults has been affected by youth today--dress, style of speech and, going on to more basic matter, sex for example. It's being tremendously effected and changed. What I'm*

driving at is that you need not be so pessimistic. As we study history, the culture changes within the country. You see it again and again. Some of you might say it's a fad but nevertheless it's an input. That's what matters. Even family life today is being affected. I don't think it's temporary when it deals with such matters as sex. How it is played out by young people is affecting the adults--what they are reading, what they are going to see, what they are going to open their minds to. Now coming back to the argument--the inputs of the poor and disadvantaged--I'm not that pessimistic that it's not having an effect.

** But there are certain value conflicts. That's education's job.....*

** I don't question the substance of it, what I question is the way in which education has been misperceived as indoctrination in this society. What the hell <u>are</u> the holy virtues?*

*** In other words, you want teachers and students to be aware of the valuing processes in society?*

** ..... And the conflicts in them--to be educated, knowledgeable and--as necessary, upset.*

** ..... For this has a way of developing their standards of judgement.*

** That's right.*

** Which must be used in a professional manner.*

** Then you get an educated society instead of a half-witted one like we have.*

** You say <u>half</u>?*

** I have a question again. Take as an example, unmarried mothers in our society--how it's frowned upon and so forth. Now, as a result of the efforts of the last five years or so (I hope I'm not exaggerating) because of the insertion of an input from another cultural style, the attitudes about the unmarried, with kids, etc., keeps undergoing change. You won't find it in the legislation but on the fron line, among family practitioners and so on and so forth. Sooner or later it will probably come in the law too.*

** But I don't think we need to get hung up on the substance of it. I think what we are really talking about is how this is communicated in the classroom.*

** That's fine--sufficient on that point. Thank you. Can we look at the point you wanted to raise--the differences in disadvantage, in particular minority group characteristics. I may be misrepresenting the actual focus.....

* I think you are presenting the focus, and I knew exactly what I wanted to say this morning..... I guess what I would like to lead us into considering is; granted that disadvantage, educational disadvantagement and ethnic identity are not the same (largely we agree on that; are there not some differences, however, between the black and Puerto Rican educational disadvantage and white disadvantage for example, or between the black and Puerto Rican, etc. I think that is the whole question. First of all I think teachers need to see the different levels of development toward quote "freedom" within any given minority group within our society. They are not all at the same stage and therefore, what the teacher in the Puerto Rican community may need to know about and expect from her parents and from the time that community activity begins to have its impact on the structure of the school and governors of the school and so forth, is the differences that are going to be felt. In other words, we can't say to teachers, you know, (let's make it very simple) "Minorities are pushing for community control and, therefore, the militant are going to do such and such and you are going to have to accept", etc. And then you tell them the prescription, because there are differences growing out of each of those ethnic minorities. That's number one, and I would like for you to talk about this even though I haven't got it firmly developed and perhaps it's not even valid. The second is the whole question of identity. And I am finding that that is different--to say nothing about the education of the disadvantaged being different in the Latin community, than it is in the Puerto Rican community, than it is in the American community and so on. The teachers need to know what are these differences qualitatively. So what do we give teachers to identify those differences, and what does it mean in teaching and to the educational experiences they provide for children. These are just two of the dimensions. The third has nothing to do with race. It has to do with the whole economic bit in the education of the disadvantaged--those who <u>are</u> economically deprived, and who <u>are</u> educationally dis-

advantaged; those who are not economically disadvantaged but who are educationally disadvantaged.

** *I can see a little latin square emerging.*

* *..... These are some of the things that were rolling around in my mind this morning when I said, let's talk it out.*

** *Would you have leads that you could give us on differences between ethnic groups. For instance, without much knowledge of La Raza, I know there appears to be no counterpart in white America. So presumably the concept of the teacher has to be sensitive to this and know what the implications are with respect to her as an authority figure, for example.*

* *And Machismo--in the Puerto Ricans. It is the manhood concept, and that moves into the whole area.....*

* *..... when an 8 year old goes round making an obscene gesture.*

* *That's right.*

* *That has several meanings.*

* *It is the manhood concept and defines the role of the male even at the age of 6. What we think is obscene is only an expression of 'machismo'.*

* *This gets us into the whole bit of whether it's immoral to live with a woman and have children. This is only playing out the machismo concept and we, with our white, Anglo Saxon, middle class values say, you know, "we've got to help these people get married!"*

* *I've got another about differences among ethnic groups. You are talking to social workers, so we are kind of gung-ho on individualization in case you haven't got that message yet. To resort to anecdote again. The director of the piano school in the Harlem School of Arts and his wife in the piano department, are both very liberal people. They were surprised when registration came by. He came to tell me, "did you know that Harlem is full of Jewish mothers?" He said that he never knew. He said that these mothers are pushing these kids to take piano lessons, to take dancing lessons and so on. He said it's a whole new world that he didn't even know was up there. It's kind of a new version of the striving middle class mother that we used to know years ago in practice, and the over-protective mother. You know, don't cross the street and all that. It's another version of the same thing which doesn't fit anybody's present day stereotypes.*

* *There are two arguments I want to present. The Puerto Rican population again, in the neighborhood are tremendously respectful of the teacher and of the school officials and so are much more difficult to organize into opposition than are the black community. This makes for sharp differences between the two groups because the black community gets very annoyed at the Puerto Rican community's subservient attitudes to the schools. Second, an unrelated item that is, I think, worth mentioning and discussing is, where do we stand on black teachers for black students. When I first got out into social work practice, if you worked with a black customer, that was never mentioned. It was never even discussed. It was assumed that you couldn't relate. In retrospect I realize how much was going on that was never put on the table. Now we know that in many black communities there's a school just for black teachers. My own view is that this is how it should be. I think it's very important to see children, see black people in authority. I would go into that direction as a high priority.*

* *This leads me to another distinction--the teachers' understanding of differences within the group. Because the minute you say black teachers, black children, I can tell you that in the black community there is a large sector that sees this as a lot of nonsense. They want good teachers and they don't care whether they're black, green, yellow or red. So the teacher, in looking at the ethnic minority group, has not only to see the differences between the different groups but also see the differences <u>within</u> the group.*

* *Policy makers have to consider this also and take a position because of the implications for teacher selection.*

* *You know, something you said about the Puerto Ricans reminds me that we even have to talk about religion. You know, you said that Puerto Ricans have this great respect for teachers and this is true. But there's a root to this. It is the Puerto Rican heritage that comes out of Catholicism's respect for constituted authority, even though the Puerto Rican may no longer be Catholic. And you're right about the Puerto Rican-black conflict.*

** *This respect for constituted authority puts you in a bind, doesn't it? Because by definition you are anti-dogma--at least you are <u>for</u> the*

critical examination of value positions. Yet by definition, if these youngsters accept a dogma, they may be very resistent to the examination of it.

* *It will be harder, that's all.*

* *In communities where you do have a number of Puerto Ricans, Negroes etc., there has grown up over the years a lot of conflict among and between them. One of the things that's happening now is that they are beginning to recognize that the enemy, "Dear Brutus", is not between me and the thee but somebody else over here--the whites. This is just about beginning and I don't know how far this is going to go. This places the white teacher, who is in these kinds of school systems, in the position to need to understand what's taking place.*

* *I want to disagree. Last month, six months ago, I would have agreed with you. Let me just give an illustration why now I disagree, although this is on an entirely different level and has nothing to do with schools. It's from counselling, social work, counselling.*

* *That has nothing to do with schools? Right off I'm disagreeing!*

* ..... *Counselling and social work agencies became concerned about the need for recruitment of minority group students, minority group faculty and the inclusion into the curriculum of concerns relevant to the background, aspirations and needs of the various minority groups. So they set up a committee of social work educators. The committee was made up of blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos and American Indians. The chairman happened to be black, and the staff person happened to be black. We brought together this committee of twenty odd people and we spent two days in conference. At the beginning of the second day I thought, what the hell is going on here--the enemy is the same, isn't it? Then I found it wasn't so at all. The Chicanos and the Puerto Ricans first of all had their thing between them--they all have Spanish backgrounds but they are miles apart, they don't talk, you know. Then the Puerto Ricans and the blacks, they had to cut each other's throat. I heard a Chicano said, this is an insult to us that the chairman of this committee is black, and that the staff member is black, and we are asked to serve under them. The real enemy was that white establishment in social work education that denies non-white students admission, that denies appointment to minority faculty, that does not put a thing in*

the curriculum about any of these groups. But nobody could get past the immediate problem. Then we had a meeting of the board where we had to give a report. There a black faculty member, a vice-chancellor, listened to this report about the black chairman and black staff member and finally said; (and this is the punch line, I think, for training teachers) "whatever made anyone think that in constructing a committee on social work education with a minority concern either at the community level or the national level, you could bring these various minority groups together around a common concern?" Well, what we are doing now is breaking that committee into task forces. So I would think that teachers are going to have to look at this whole minority concept and not take it as a lump.

*** Can I make one point? It <u>would</u> have worked if the enemy without had been threatening--if the threat of the white would have been so great they might have been forced into collusion. If I am right, this suggests that the apparent divergence between whites and the black minority in general, isn't as great perhaps, as it sounds.*

** The thing is that it was the establishment that put it together.*

** That's correct.*

** I still don't give up on the point I was talking about earlier. What's really happening, and I'm not talking about the sophisticated counsellor education, I'm talking about the people down there in the ghettos who are the black, browns and so on. They are beginning to see for the first time that there is the establishment over there, and that their best bet is to begin to understand each other. This is just a beginning. However, in this attempt, you have a process where you will find different groups getting together and this will give them strength to move back into the multi-group situation and to really put some strength into that. For example, I know Howard used to have white students (and we still have, of course), and some of the faculty members ask why do these white students come in and get by themselves. (You know how you go into a white university where you see groups of blacks get by themselves). This is an important part of a phase of development because to the extent they identify themselves, they then derive strength from this kind of identification to move back into the lives of the group. As long as we understand this and encourage this kind of thing we have*

an open door, but if you try to integrate them as they come in, there you fail.

* *Absolutely.*

* *This of course, leads to the philosophy of black power.*

* *This means we need to understand what is taking place and not feel they are against us because of their need to draw strength from each other as a means of identification.*

* *..... Even though their verbalization may be against us.*

* *That's right.*

* *I hear black students in the cafeteria at my university (not social work students); "whitey this" and "whitey that" and every other student is whitey. And in class and on the elevator they'll talk about the whitey student. And they don't want a part of whitey.*

* *They have to do this to draw their own strength. This is one of the things that is very important in working with inter-group and intra-group relations. And this is the kind of thing I would hope social work would get hold of, but often it doesn't.*

* *Teachers should get it.*

* *We have a Puerto Rican caucus at school and a black caucus. We don't have any Chicanos but we have a demi-peer group, a semi-peer group. The other night we had a confrontation with them. We all needed it very badly. And they brought community people in and I got all kinds of threatening telegrams about these problems, like, "we demand you to use our agency now". So a few of us were at this meeting plus the community people. There were a large number of Puerto Rican students: Many more than I thought we had. There were ten case workers alone. They were the least of the number. It was a terrible meeting with fighting, screamingand yelling. It was very Puerto Rican. Anyway, one of our black faculty members who was invited for some role he was carrying in the school, was trying to make a point. And he said something about ethnic minorities--black and Puerto Rican. And the group went after him and he wasn't able to say another word. They told him, "Do not mention <u>black</u> in this room". As a matter of fact, one of the reasons the Puerto Rican caucus is getting so strong is their antipathy not to the whites but to the blacks.*

** *Whatever makes us imagine that decades if not centuries of*

prejudice are going to be eradicated by some social problem--even a major one? Let me ask a question concerning the only area we have not dealt with. You've been very considerate in focussing on the teacher. Now, what about the teacher vis a vis the social worker? Do you want to give a message about a kind of collaboration with the social worker--you know, sensititivy to the social worker and so on.

* I think social workers have to do a job on themselves first. I would be very loathe to ask of the teachers that they relate themselves to social workers in the state social workers are in now. There's a theme about that. I read an article called "The little white clinic in the little red school house" and that's kind of what I mean that at the moment I am not at all sure that social work practitioners understand that the school is the central place in the community where all people will go. I don't think they really understand. At least in New York City, and I think also in Boston and some places on the east coast, when the social worker relates to the school child who has a problem, he gets critical about the school rather than supportive of the client.

* Whatever happened to the school social worker?

* In this community they're up 125th street.

* The way school social workers organize New York City is not typical.

* Up in New York state it's healthier.

* I would feel that training teachers to know about social workers is hardly a priority. I hope however, that they would know something about social work--how it operates and how it might relate to their jobs. They should know something about the resources available--in particular for the economically disadvantaged, a certain knowledge about public assistance and other income maintenance problems. It's vital, I think, that a teacher should know they exist and know about them because this is what she will be confronted with all the time.

* But you see there I wouldn't be anxious to have them know about social workers. I would want them to have a heavy does of whatever you give in training that deals with attitudes. They should be helped in their attitudes about the people, social workers work with. Probably one of the most destructive attitudes teachers have for example, is about the poor. This is particularly so about that group in the poor

who are dependent upon public assistance. Teachers as professionals react more conservatively to life than does the non-professional man in the street--(I was going to say ultra-conservatively). In public welfare, helping groups in the community deal with and understand why these people have a right to assistance, why they have to be administered to, why there has to be a governmental structure for it, the worst group in the world was not the tax-payer group, not the businessman group, it was the teachers in the New York City school system. So to some extent they do need to know about social workers' clients. But maybe you are right, we are not ready for them to know about social work itself.

* *Another thing that is happening I think, is that the school system itself is going to be interpenetrated by other agencies--many more than at present. In particular there will be an interpenetration by parent assemblies. This will bring many different types into the school system. As well, we have psychologists, social workers, probably sociologists, to teach the teacher what to do. The interpenetration of the school system is a problem. I'm just describing the situation.*

* *It's happening, sure.*

* *Now, social work has faced that in its own bailiwick as far as other disciplines are concerned, and increasingly so in our faculties. But then we start talking in social work at least, about how to speak the language of these other disciplines--to understand how to use them as consultants and so on and so forth. I dare say you'll face the same problem in schools in the 70's. Therefore teacher training in how to use other consultants will probably rival that of social workers' --probably to a higher degree. What I'm trying to say is that the teacher cannot any more be simply conceived in a sort of simple, little red school house sort of fashion. That's out. That's impossible. Therefore, teacher training will have to find means for enabling teachers to have knowledge, skills and understandings of using others, as their use relates to their primary responsibility in the class. How to do that?--I don't know,-we have our own troubles with it in social work.*

* *May I say something? In the first place I think that teachers like other people, have pretty much the same general opinion of social*

workers--that is that those are the people who are low men on the totem pole.

** I thought teachers were.

* No, social workers are much lower. We are the second oldest profession!

* There's something I would like to say about Headstart. We began by saying Headstart is a program of educating--until Congress said, O.K., let's put it in the Office of Education. So then we said, oh, no, that is not what we meant. This is child development, don't get it in there. There were several reasons but one of them was that the whole education establishment is so much against any kind of change. The education establishment makes change very difficult. As you go around talking about the Headstart program to Boards of Education you get only trouble. And teachers are part of this, you know. They are part of this system you are talking about. It's part of the tradition they 'understand' all this, so that when we begin to talk about social work and educational social workers and teachers, we have already a built-in conflict. It's usually over who controls what in terms of the child. And in the Headstart program, for example, the teacher is in no doubt about it. This is her child. It seems to me that one of the things we have to get in teacher training is an understanding that in a sense each child really belongs to the community.

* There are laws about kidnapping!

* ..... and all of us as professional people are working with this child and his family.

** It seems to me that this is the other side of the coin that was mentioned earlier; namely, if you define the teacher's role and make it, as it were, classroom specific, then presumably the teacher needs to know about the social worker's role and his specific domain too. Is that right?

* Yes. And that they are both, as well as the nutritionist, as well as the physician, the dentist, whoever, really working with this child together and that the child does not belong to any one of them.

* I hope that you made that interpretation clearly in the context of what I was saying. You said that the teacher belongs in the classroom. That was not what I was saying. The teacher should take

responsibility, total responsibility for what happens in the classroom. That doesn't mean that the teacher is locked in there, and that the teacher's only concern is within the classroom.

* *The point is that in the classroom the student is cast in a particular role and that is not the whole of anyone's life. I was just thinking about how complicated it would be to train teachers in the first place it's boring to tell them that the nutritionist and the social worker do all these things. It seems to me one would want to separate whatever one did on the classroom part of teacher training from the other--perhaps have a session or a unit or something on the systemic community view, and what happens in the community, and how the community divides itself up to be helpful to families and children, so that when the teacher is in the school she'll experience the differences. I mean it'll be done conceptually.*

** *I think you are going to have a couple of problems, methodologically though, because if you introduce teachers , who are presumably going to care anyway, to problems of hunger etc. so that they get disturbed about them, they will say what can we do?*

* *Well, that's different.*

** *..... then it seems to me you have to opt for saying that here are the things that are available to do, and leave it at that.*

* *About the resources, yes.*

* *But I think that the problem of relating teachers and social workers to these other professions is really more complex than the way in which we have dealt with it. And it is complex because of the overlaps and the increasing difficulty in drawing boundaries around any professional knowledge areas. They are so interrelated and that, I think, makes it difficult to say how the social worker is related to the teacher, to the nutritionist and so on. I think, as we look ahead in training of the professions, we have to return to the problem that we discussed before lunch, which concerned the professional culture, and the way that people in the past have had sustenance--they had a plaque to put on the wall and all that. Now, what we have to do is to ask people to identify with larger arenas. So the teacher would be identified with a body of knowledge and it's going to help her in her task. But it's going to be all mixed up with other knowledges that*

others have.

* *Let's try this out for size. I was down south, and a physicist, a university official, was interviewing me. He talked about social work for a while, and then he said, I want to try out an idea on you. He said that he knew from his university that there were a lot of different professors in allied subjects. He saw the overlap so he asked, why in the hell don't we have a school of related professions? I was intrigued. There was a simple-minded solution to a complex problem and it seems very attractive. If we're to lick this problem in the 70's and 80's then the probability is that in some kinds of training somebody better get started (maybe teacher training). We ought to set up a system of training in which the inter-relationship is central. Perhaps you would teach teachers within that context. What I'm driving at is that you have to have a structual change somewhere to achieve it.*

** *Theoretically we are devising a system that will in fact accomplish the purpose you have in mind.*

* *You don't want to be in the position of tacking on. It's got to be integral, and to be integral, you have to look at the structure. If you know what function you want, you have to look at the structure. The present structure that we have in universities--although we talk 'interdiscipline', it does not reflect interdisciplinary action in the structure. So an interminable number of meetings between departments are spent actually in guarding turf. This is because no university administration as yet has taken the risk and made a change structurally that channels things so they've got to be interdisciplinary.*

* *I don't think you have to wait until you go to school to relate education to related professions. I think you have already suggested an answer. In every university I know about, whether it's a school of social work or school of education, we could begin training groups together on certain areas where teachers could take courses in school social work and social workers could.....*

* *Some do.....*

* *They do in a limited way.*

* *But it's not the same thing.*

* *It's a limited example, isn't it?*

* Very limited.

* It's a very territorial thing.

* And this may be one of the things in which Triple T in Missouri can help both teach training and social work education.

You know, it's very interesting, we keep saying teacher training and social work education.

** The distinction between training and education is extremely significant.

* It is.

* And we wouldn't dream of saying social work training.

* But we say teacher training and social work education and they are both supposed to produce professionals.

* I would like to say something about this business of different schools. At Howard University there are so many schools now that have education for social welfare but, however, not in the way other people do their things in terms of their own disciplines. One of the things we are beginning to do is forming a coordinating committee for social workers.

* I have a reservation about all this--it's very depressing. If you put zero and zero together, as a mathematician will tell you, you get zero. The state of the quote "human relations" sciences are not that secure. One man's plausible guess backed by some evidence against another's has low probability. I could take any research (I'll be egotistical about it), in social science today and fault it on any number of logical or methodological grounds--and I could attack the conclusions as to its degree of probability. That annoys me--that I could say what I said annoys me--because zero plus zero equals zero.

* But you don't make the knowledge any harder by teaching it collectively. But you might be on the right path.

* You know, I think one of the reasons for calling it teacher training--this is really a question--is because historically in this country, we have really seen the teacher as the transmitter of the great American values. But we haven't really seen the teacher as an integral professional with judgements and so forth. She's a kind of a vehicle to the Board of Education. Somewhere, something with an American flag hanging over it says this is what the kids have to learn

and you're the one who has to bring it to them. Now, that's not a professional role.

** *I have two comments. First, educators themselves are concerned with the label and will talk freely about teacher education. They hope the message will eventually get through to others. The other thing is another kind of historical explanation. If you study the development of teacher training institutions you'll find that they developed apart from universities. And I think it was the universities that were concerned with making a distinction between their <u>education</u> and those <u>other</u> training systems.*

* *Social work too?*

* *Social work is an activity that prematurely professionalized itself.*

* *O.K.*

** *Maybe teaching too? You had a point you wanted to bring up.*

* *O.K. I want to raise the idea of marginality. As we work with people in social work, we see that some in the intra-group situation are just marginal. In other words, they have their relationships to significant others that are different in terms of the identification of certain sub-groups. Within the Negro group there are some who identify with this kind of on-going situation and others will identify with that. And that is because they are marginally related to these things. The teacher has to realize that when she has groups within the classroom or anywhere, they are not all that she sees. She has to get some differentiation to understand them.*

** *So that a black one is really a white one?*

* *Could very well be.*

* *That's a 'cookie'--black on the outside, white on the inside.*

* *A zebra.*

* *(There's a black and white advertizing agency that uses a zebra motif.)*

* *At one point earlier we talked about goals--what a teacher or trainer of teachers is trying to achieve. One of the things we need to be conscious of is whether the means we use for teaching and for training and for education are consistent with the ends we want to achieve.*

* That leads to another point--we are in fact teaching the teachers of tomorrow with the teachers of yesterday.

* And also, it bears on what the community that hires the teacher really wants from the teacher and it has to be their decision and not that of teacher trainers alone. But if the community really wants a teacher who will educate, then they have to be prepared for some difficulties and most communities don't know that's what it means.

* We have talked about community two or three dozen times today. And when you named the groups that you have asked to come in, I was aware of the fact that at no time did you talk about the community qua community.

** For this reason--we did not know what it was.

* Well, nobody else does.

* You mean as a sociological phenomenon or as a spokesman for some people?

* As I understand the three T's, it has some component parts to it. This T.T.T. business at least in my university, has a policy committee that is made up of the university, the public school administration, the teachers, and the community. And the community block has parity with the other three. After I got into this and you invited me to come, I thought that I couldn't go over thrte to the University of Missouri ignorant of the T.T.T. project at my own university, so I got them to tell me about it just yesterday at lunch. Now, they get community representatives in the same way that we are going to get them for community control groups--the same way social work is going to get them representing the delivery of services. We don't know what community is but we are going to get somebody.

* Why is that such a difficulty?

* I'm not saying it is. I want to know what he has in his consortia representing quote "community".

* It should be the Missouri community.

** O.K., but I'm going to have to give a complicated answer. When I first wrote the proposal, I believed the American statement of itself. America is a technologically advanced society and demonstrably so. When I asked the question, how did it become technologically advanced, I came to the conlusion that it was because America uses expertise

and attacks the problems of technology systematically, scientifically, and empirically. So it seemed to me that if you are going to attack social problems, then this is precisely the approach that should pay off. So I decided to attempt to do that at this particular point in time. Then I decided, rightly or wrongly, that expertise lay in control of the people who had given lifelong thought to the nature of the problem and possible solution. It did not reside necessarily (and you'll forgive the analogy) in the knowledge of the patient who although he knows where he hurts does not necessarily know how to solve the problem of the ache. This, rightly or wrongly, was my position. I still adhere to it because I have yet to hear a rational refutation. I should add though that subsequently, in the meetings associated with T.T.T.--when I was out of the country--we were subjected to intense pressure to "involve the community". So now I've written into the project, provision for getting community representatives--whatever that means, and perhaps having one or two community consortia. Now, my personal position on this is that I do not see the logical justification of the move. I see the political justification. I see that in order to retain some degree of viability within the whole T.T.T. program we had to do it to accommodate to what was stated as a political need. But I still don't see that it is necessarily going to produce any kind of knowledge pay-off.

* *I don't agree with that.*

* *I do.*

* *I don't think we should pass lightly over this phrase "the community, whatever the hell that is". I don't think we should accept that. I believe that I made this point earlier, that the use of the term is a misnomer, it is confusing. We use it as an euphemism and it obscures. I think we ought to use a vocabulary that is descriptive of what we really mean. Now, if it were to involve customers who used a particular service, O.K. I can define and might even be able to set up a system where they would be genuinely represented. But to involve people and just say community, I think is both bad and misleading and there's a lot of danger in it.*

* *I'll buy that. But then the primary customers of the public schools are the kids. And the next group are the parents. Now, when*

I say I don't buy it, I don't buy the proposition that the customers do not have a level of expertise. However, they are defined--I say that now and I don't care whether you are talking about the students or the parents or the community leader in that order--they have another level of expertise that might be as valuable in defining the content or the direction of teacher training as the social worker, the linguists, etc. etc. Now, I go back to something we said earlier--it is the community (and now it may be the parents, or the teachers, or it may be the politicians at the local level, and I agree with you again, we would have to be specific here, but for short I say the "community") that is going to define the role of the teacher and that is going to reconstruct that educational system that we were talking about--even though their expertise is at a different level.

** *Let me make two points, One, that particular expertise can't be backed up by writing. So to this extent we would be relying on the consortium information only--and we would be victims of our own selection. The other point is that we really had a heavy hang-up over the diagnosis of community, so we couldn't decide on the influence groups. Should we get Black Panthers? Should we get, for arguments sake, black businessmen? Should we get Mexican-Americans? What should it be? It seemed to me, whatever community group we got,we would be gound to get a minority view of the position. So the utility of it would depend on whether we had been lucky enough to hit on where the power source lay.*

* *May I ask this question. There is one community group within this system which is visible, reliable and constant, and all of it is there--and that's the students. Are you going to them?*

** *Not at the moment, no. But there is another point I should make. Assuming we get out of our consortia, a definite direction (and we will), when we start to develop our curricula, our teaching aids, our text books, our experience prescriptions, and so on, at <u>that</u> point we <u>must</u> have as representative a sample of student judgements, attitudes--student reality, if you like--as we can possibly get. So as far as community involvement is concerned, we can see a much better justification for bringing it into Phase II. It then becomes fully incorporated into the program.*

* I can see the validity of your point.

* I don't because it runs counter to what I think we've learned in social work education. Now, what you are saying is, at a given point you will involve students, parents etc.?

** Yes.

* But you will then be taking to them a position, a direction.

** We'll be taking to them a problem. For example, we might go saying we want to develop in our program an understanding of language that allows our teachers to have some idea of cultural relativity and to appreciate the part that language plays in the disadvantaged community. Then we say to the community, how can we get this? Let us visit with you about your language as it is used. Then admittedly we take the position that we want to talk about language but we are also saying that it is <u>your</u> language, and how it feels to you, that we want to talk about.

* They are just identifying the problem.

* You know, if you want to have a product accepted then I would say it would be politically important that the people who are going to have to accept it are involved now--but you do have a problem deciding who the consumers are.

* It's a temporary, shifting population.

** If your question is, have I predefined within the role of the educational institution, certain functions that we say we have a right to define because of our professional knowledge then the answer is yes. Now please argue with me. I'm genuinely concerned about this and I recognize that I am taking what is, in many respects, an unpopular position.

* Can I say something? I think everybody is right!! Secondly, I think one of the problems you are going through is again the matter of professionalism and expertize and here I think that there may be some validity, I'm not sure. I don't hold much of a candle to the professionalism thing but one of the good things about professionalism is that theoretically a professional person, anyone of us, is supposed to be able to see beyond our personal experience. I think that that is one of the things that would justify the selection of professionals. It's more productive for him to have us all talk. Now, although we all

use anecdotes, the whole tenor of the thing is not only anecdotal. What we know isn't from our 'experience' alone but from a collection of experiences, theories, ideas, and education--the whole thing. Now, if you want to get something defined, I can understand simply saying that. The thing I have found in working with community people, customers or recipients of services, is that you need <u>them</u> absolutely to know what's going to happen in the programs so that they really feel it will happen. What happens is that you get, because of the nature of the thing, the immediate response of the immediate person and that's why we have such trouble finding the representative. They are everybody, because they carry that personal thing that's been washed out of us. I don't know if I said.....

* *It's the student probably who would give the most because he's there with them. He's the captive within the system--and on a stable long term basis.*

** *<u>If</u> you can sample widely enough and.....*

* *That's my point, within a school.*

** *If you are encouraging me to turn it into a research design--O.K. I've got delusions that my bag is research--and this certainly isn't research.*

* *You're wasting your time--it's all right, I'm joking.*

** *There's one piece of information I would like to cite as evidence but I realize that I'm cheating when I do it. In our consortium with inner city teachers we found that that systematicity was lacking. We constantly had the same point reiterated. Issues tended to be the ones most salient, and they tended to reflect popular opinion that everyone knew about anyway. Of course, they demonstrated a great deal of conviction and concern but I'm afraid, no great ability in analyzing their role in the system, within the organization. They were without any marked awareness of the complexity of the whole special context. To this extent it did not seem to be very rewarding.*

* *I confess to you I'm not convinced.*

** *O.K.*

* *The City Planning Commission in New York had this big meeting and they brought together over a long period of time "all the experts" where they unveiled the plan. I was speaking and I had just finished*

delivering pearls of wisdom that I thought were going to go down to posterity about welfare aspects of city planning, when suddenly voices from all over the room said; "DAMN THE MASTERS' PLAN". Then they came and took over the meeting. Now I listened to these gentlemen, (they were very polite, they weren't going to attack me personally). They pointed out that I just didn't represent the community and that nobody had asked them in on that whole process. Now would you say they're not the community? I'm not going to say there is a community, but I am going to say that there are recommendations in that plan that effect the lives of people in sections of the city whose voice was never asked for. They probably wouldn't say about welfare what I would say about it, but there was no input and that plan will never get off the ground.

*** Let me make a point. Assume that you had asked for public opinion. Then assume the plan was produced and along comes another public that says, my voice wasn't heard. All you can do then is produce a logical argument that says, you had your chance, mate, but you didn't take it.*

* There's a basic point here. I believe that one of the things that really is a tremendous problem is unrecognized in the city today. It is this very business that no matter which community, which group of people you involve, there's another group. that says, we were not-- as a consequence I think a good deal of city action, of construction, for example, has come to a halt.*

* It is not an unsurmountable problem though--if we differentiate the kinds of questions we ask the different populations to be experts about. You don't ask a man who has never tasted cornflakes in his life, what he things about cornflakes. He'll give an opinion--no question-- but it will be worthless. So when you try to get some idea of what people think on fundamental matters, you want to point the question that you have some reason to believe they have some experience wich. But if you are going to throw out any old question in a free for all style, that's not too bright.*

* Even in teacher training there are diverse groups that would like to be heard, and I do think that part of our problem is that no matter which group you hear from, there will be another group that

will disagree.

** You know, if Ray were to say to the social work profession, "I heard this from social workers," they would disown us. "They represent social work--who says?"*

*** However, a professional will recognize the viability of different positions. They might protest that theirs is not in there. But let me make one point. This just occurred to me as a kind of post hoc rationalization. To some extent we do have the community represented indirectly, in that you have contact with the community; and education research has gone into the community; and educational opinion has been sought in the community--our literature search documents it. To this extent, the community viewpoint, whether it has been articulated in precisely the same form or not, is in there. Now I presume, and this is a delusion of grandeur perhaps, that when our program is completed, it can be logically defended and convincingly argued in such a way that whoever raises a legitimate objection can in fact be answered. If he can't, then we've got an inferior program. So I don't think that you can just say the community wasn't there.*

** I will be very interested at the end when you finish all this and really have something to say to whatever community, about teacher training, whether what you just said is going to be satisfying to them.*

** But supposing the Missouri people were to say to the communities; "we tried this out, these are some of the issues to be confronted in teacher training, what more issues do you know? Do you think these are issues?" It's not as total as you thought.*

** That's just saying add to it, add to it, and that's right.*

** It is saying, for example, we have decided that language is part of it, not what do you have to tell us about language?*

** It comes full cycle back to your problem. In our society I think that it works this way--or should work this way: technicians, experts, make their best judgements and present them. Then the channels have to be opened, in a political process where decisions are actually made on all these plans--as in the New York discussions. Accessability to the political arena to discuss that report is open and has a evolving mechanism--it is rolling participation and that what you said is right.*

** This has been done in whole community participation. And I think*

that at the level of the initial input the quote "expert" has got to be redefined, a new groups has to be considered as expert. I don't know how to tell you to get it in there, and I agree that if you get one group in then another group will say, we are experts too, but you are in a much stronger position having had a group in that were not sociologists, social workers, etc. but who are for example, only parents of children.

** *O.K. It seems to me that the way teacher training is instituted at Missouri, the university is protected at the moment. In fact, the teacher training program is there and teachers are being produced. To the extent that we reorganize a program then is almost a domestic matter, and the question that the community faces is, do we want teachers out of that particular program or not.*

* *I must remind my colleagues here that there is a group in our profession that is saying that students of social work cannot legitimately train social workers because the consumers of the services do not have a role in the training. Swim's latest pamphlet says precisely that!*

* *Stop the world I want to get off!*

* *To make a complete parallel this is where the intervention will have to come into decisions about training teachers.*

* *I would like very much to watch this.*

* *The point I want to make is that I don't think you should ignore a political reality. This is a growi ng trend.*

** *I think the logical issue becomes, in your judgement is the action being taken in getting 'involvement' going to give a substantive pay-off or a goodwill pay-off. I think that's the name of the game.*

* *You named it exactly earlier. That's why earlier I agreed with you when you said that in the political round it is important to do it. But is it exactly what you need to get your content started?*

* *I have a question about accessability to becoming a teacher. Are you dealing with the financial conditions, eligibility of environments, are you studying that in your teacher program.*

** *No.*

* *That's something that the quote "community" is very much interested in.*

** *O.K.*

* Do you consider urban-rural?

** No, we arbitrarily cut off at urban. However, I think that we will find coming out of each of the investigations what you might call basic educational principles. In particular they will include, it seems to me, (you made the point earlier), that the privileged and the underprivileged sorely need special treatment in comprehending of the nature to this very complicated society of ours.

* I would just like to get this on the tape. When I first received the letter-from the University of Missouri, I was a real sceptic--here goes some more of that fancy, crazy stuff with people locked up in a room. Now, having gone through the experience, I just wish very much that we could devise in our field, in social work education, some of the same kind of input. I don't know if you have got anything, but I got a tremendous lot from the exchange.....

* I said, as much as ten years ago when we were starting off community organization, let's hole up in a room with some other people. I only had one effect--on the curriculum advisory committee in New York. I started off that project in that way. For the advisory committee we got out of the social work bag. That was a struggle. We should do more of this.

* Yes. I really want to know what you do and what happens. I hope you got some useful input from the social work view.

** Well, there will be a document produced on this, and you'll get a copy--for your sins! We don't yet know whether we will be funded into the second phase. However, even if we do get stopped we will have documentation on how the problem is seen from a number of perspectives at this point in time. We will have some insights from experts that are obviously relevant to education. I will apologize in advance for the injustice I'll do you all in that document but I'll be trying desperately hard not to. As an earnest of my good intentions, I would like to get my sincere appreciation of your discussion here, onto the record. My thanks to you all.

* * * * *

SECTION II

This section contains the greater part of the material abstracted during the literature search. The items are presented alphabetically (by author) according to the following convention. The bibliographical data comes first. Next comes a brief descriptive statement of the nature of the item. Then, under "A", are listed any data supported points, or any points known to be data supportable. Under "B" are listed assertions made in the source material but which appear to be data free. Recommendations made by authors follow, under the "C" heading. Finally, where the abstractor has seen fit, some comments are listed under "D". These mostly indicate what other information is contained in the source item.

It will be remembered that the abstractors were graduate social workers and their social work orientation, as we intended, will have influenced their judgements. However, an educational requirement placed on them served to focus their attention also. We required the searchers to base their selection on whether or not they, as social workers, felt the information before them could be thought to be germane, even remotely germane, to the teacher of urban disadvantaged children. In so far as they thought that there was information here that the teacher, or the trainer of teachers, of disadvantaged children ought to know or appreciate, they were to include it.

Bahal, Y., W. Madaus, and Alvin Winder. "A motivational approach to compensatory education," Social Work, 1968, 13(2), pp. 16-24.

Description of counseling aspects of "Upward Bound" a residential program for under-achieving 9th and 10th graders from low SES levels.

C. Purpose of counseling was a realistic increase in students' level of aspiration and motivation toward educational goals. Three problem areas were managed:
   1. The students' negative attitude toward authority and his consequent alienation. Alienation consisted of both student's feeling of estrangement from school's educational goal and his estrangement from seeing the fulfillment of a promise of a tangible career involving educational commitment.
   2. Student's low capacity for verbalization and self-expression.
   3. Student's lack of role models for educational goals.

These characteristics were counteracted by three major forms of organization built into the program:

1. Strong student government opened way for mutual trust and cooperation between students and administration.
2. A committe for evaluation of students for whom dismissal had been suggested. This body in practice did primarily counseling, evaluating students on various criteria, and involving them in the evaluation.
3. Group counseling with a major goal of creating an atmosphere in which members would feel free to express conflicting attitudes toward the selection or rejection of an educational future; feelings of alienation and conflicts over authority.

The program provided an atmosphere of freedom and care from interested adults. Students were not asked to passively accept society's educational goals but to explore both these goals and the possibility of making their own choices actively.

Bernstein, Saul, Alternatives to Violence: Alienated Youth and Riots, Race and Poverty, New York: Association Press, 1967.

Descriptive study. Its conclusions and inferences regarding alienated youth of minority groups are based on 289 interviews of youth workers in nine cities.

A.1. characteristics of alienated youth (from secondary sources):
   a. inadequate family background
   b. dropouts
   c. in frequent police trouble
   d. irregularly employed
   e. much drinking and drug use
   f. produce illegitimate children
   g. spend most of waking hours on the streets
   h. have deep cynicism about the system and future.

B.1. Belief in social action and participation in civil rights movement by these youth is limited as they felt that quick results are an emotional need for them and civil rights goals are too remote.

2. These ghetto youth have little faith in change via social action.
3. Nonviolence theme is not acceptable to them as they appear to feel need to retaliate on an eye for an eye basis.
4. The impact of civil rights movement on them has heightened their sensitivity to racial slums, produced greater suspicion and a changed sense of identity (more self respect).
5. The impact of anti-poverty programs on them has been slight and they are seen as believing it has mostly failed to dent poverty.
6. The youth see the Job Corps as producing no significant results with the Neighbourhood Youth Corps doing better but not involving enough youth.
7. Feelings of these youth concerning race and nationality are judged to be:
   a. they have great pride in their race,
   b. there is inconclusive evidence as to whether anti-white feeling among them is increasing.

C.1. We need a multi-faceted approach to poverty--including increased income, better education, greater opportunities, improved living conditions, and more services to the poor.
2. We must create more and better jobs not merely offer training for present jobs.
3. We need a guaranteed annual income instead of demeaning, stigmatizing public welfare systems.
4. Education should put emphasis on preventing the formation of an attitude of hopelessness in either teachers or ghetto children,
   a. Need smaller classes,
   b. Need teachers dedicated to the slum child;
   c. Need flexible and imaginative administration,
   d. Need more school social workers,
   e. More extensive hiring of neighborhood youth and adults meet the needs of alienated children.
5. We need public works programs with on the job training by private business.
6. Increasid hiring of ghetto youth.
7. Hiring of ghetto youth for community service jobs in health, social welfare, education, recreation, etc.

Bernstein, Saul. Youth on the streets. New York: Association Press, 1964.

"This book is about youth groups at the social and economic bottom of our society, disturbingly alienated from the middle-class community. Most of them have come from minority backgrounds, such as Negro, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican and others. What are they doing, feeling, and thinking? What are the patterns of their groupings and with what bearing on delinquency? How do a life and the future look to them? These are major questions to which the book is addressed."

B.1. Sublower and minority class youngsters have no access to or they cannot effectively utilize educational, financial, and

social opportunities to achieve personal satisfaction and status.

a. Home and neighborhood influences often are in conflict with those of institutions which represent the general community (e.g. school, police) resulting in a youngster's perception that upward roads are blocked.

b. In some cities not only are there no legitimate opportunities for upward mobility, but there are increasingly few illegitimate ones, e.g. via the rackets.

2. In many lower-class neighborhoods there is a relatively stable sub-culture in which forms of criminal and delinquent values are accepted as the norm.

a. Models for children growing up in these neighborhoods, the standard bearers, behave according to this normative standard and pressures for the children to conform to the models are great.

b. The illegal-oriented sub-culture is never pure; hence, the children within the neighborhood are exposed to some individuals who have law-abiding standards; also, the larger community (e.g. schools) influences the children - the influence may be negative for the most part, but it is felt.

3. Negative attributes often pinned to Negroes are often more the result of poverty than of color.

4. A relatively new phenomena occurs in the US: poverty surrounded by highly visible affluence and the general nearness of the poor to the products of prosperity.

a. This phenomena is responsible for the tension which develops between the aspirations created in poor youngsters and their impoverished resources for legitimately obtaining expensive things.

b. However negatively the poor child might perceive the middle-class person, and the middle-class ideas, the rewards of the middle-class are attractive to him.

5. "Hostile, sublower-class youngsters do not respond favorably to pretty speeches. They are reached by concrete evidence in the mainstream of their experience."

6. Youngsters in the sublower-classes have more difficulties moving into adulthood.

a. Independence from parents comes earlier for this child than a middle-class child but other dimensions of adulthood are confusing.

b. Marriage and a regular job are central goals, yet the route to these has become increasingly educational; many of these youngsters are high school drop outs and the route is therefore blocked for them.

C. After many, repeated failures in school, the youngster acquires negative feelings for school and his experience there and he is apt to regard returning for still another try as hopeless.

7. In reference to the more hostile, sublower-class youth groups:

a. They have generally experienced repeated rejection by various representatives of the general community.

b. Members have damaged sense of self worth.

c. They feel that most of the "respectable" world is against them.

d. They have models and precedents for their belligerence.
e. They cannot emotionally tolerate the risk of profit and loss in conforming.
f. Fear of rejection is great.
g. Security is found in group aggression.
h. Many youths in these groups are highly undisciplined and are able to exert relatively little control over their impulses.
i. They "crave" excitement and are weak in the ability to anticipate the consequences of their behavior.

8. These youngsters do not see education as desirable in itself; they can see education's utilitarian value, e.g. getting a job; "however, why go through the effort".
9. Lower-class youth and their families are often strongly affected by population movement.
   a. Many people have come from rural areas in which they did not learn or prepare to deal with the confusion and complexity of a modern ghetto.
   b. Often education in rural areas was inadequate.
   c. Latin-Americans have an additional linguistic problem.
10. Lower-class female has "an arduous and even bleak existence. She tends to feel very much exploited."
11. What often seems to middle-class eyes to be bizzare dress may mean to the youths an identity outlet in that bizzare dress is clearly visible and rebellious against the standards of dress of the larger community.
12. Among these more hostile youths, being smart, outwitting others, pulling clever wisecracks at someone's expense are highly prized attributes.
13. Psychologically these youngsters grasp and can be influenced by the very specific and concrete.
   a. At least in initial work with these youngsters, abstract ideas e.g. honesty, industry, etc., are not meaningful.
   b. Their life experiences have taught them to be distrustful and only tangible evidences are acceptable.
   c. If one suggests a change in anti-social behavior, specific alternatives must be made available.
14. A characteristic of these youths' behavior patterns is to project the blame for any difficulties they might experience onto others.
15. Low self-esteem is characteristic of these youths, also.
16. "On the centuries - old free will - determinism issue, many of these youngsters have, perhaps without being conscious of it, taken the position that the areas in which choice can be exercised, in which free and intelligent decisions can be made and followed, are very small. They are, for the most part, controlled and driven by circumstances, conditions, values and feelings, without sufficient opportunities for intelligently thinking about choices and values, which is the essence of human dignity."
17. The school is recognized by many of these youths as the way out, but the school instrinsically lacks appeal for them; it is the scene of failure and frustration; these youths contribute heavily

to the drop-out class, but many schools have found this particular kind of youngster so difficult, that in some instances these youths are school "pushouts".

18. In order for these youths to "give-up" self and society destructive behavior, they must be motivated to give up what they consider important for wasting their time in school.
    a. This means a transformation in values and behavior; this transformation requires patience, faith, and skill.
    b. This also means developing a school program which makes sense to these kids and interpreting the personalities and problems of these kids to school administrators.
    c. This may also mean providing for these kids a decent place to study in, since their home environment may be lacking in this.
19. Helping (helpful) relationships with the type of youngster here considered have a fairly typical cycle.
    a. The relationship or relating cycle usually begins with youth being suspicious and with their engaging in much testing of adult figure. "We'll show you how bad we are, and then let's see if you still care about us."
    b. Occasionally, there may be a period of a kind of honeymoon behavior initially, with the youths fearing to show anything ugly in themselves.
    c. Worker must demonstrate to the youngsters that it is not necessary for them to continue their performance or this behavior.
    d. Worker communicates the delicate distinction between disapproving certain kinds of behavior and liking and accepting youth as people; they can grasp this.
20. These children are typically in need of the type of relationship which would have evolved with a good parent, including abiding interest, regularity in living routines, sharing troubles and support during stress.
21. Many of this type of youth are confused in the area of sex identification and a meaningful experience with adequate, strong adult contributes to youth's sense of who and what he is.
22. Goals relating to authority with this type of youth includes preventing incidents which are damaging, help them tolerate reasonable control, and to help them internalize authority so that they can develop their own controls.
    a. The healthier of these youths have impulses to mature which are responsive to appeal.
    b. Crises can be utilized, emphasis on painful consequences of lack of control.
    c. Rewards for restraint are available, social approval and consequence for such control.
23. "Big" talk and tough talk frequently is an attempt to hide deep lack in self-confidence and poor self-image.
24. Family troubles often give the youth feeling that parents don't respect him and also that his family is "shoddy".
25. Poor occupational models in family and neighborhood, low tolerance for authority, and perceived low expectations of them by others, youths acquire unrealistic perceptions, poor work habits, low impulse control and ineptness in finding and keeping jobs.

Billingsley, Andrew and Amy Tate Billingsley, "Negro family life in America," Social Service Review, 1965, 29,310-319.

B.1. Northern discrimination against Negro is not so much overt efforts to discriminate an deprive Negro of opportunities (as it is in the South) but rather an inability to grasp need for special community efforts to overcome pervasive poverty, social isolation and psychological alienation in Negro ghettos.
2. The relative absence of significant role models occupying major positions in the crucial institutions of socialization and social control presents obstacles of Negro families who would like to have their child "be somebody".
3. The Negro child cannot see himself in authority figures and positions of power and influence; the child's efforts to deal with autonomy crises are severely restricted.
4. One of most crippling handicaps in Negro Americans' experience is a deep-seated sense of inferiority; this feeling derives from being simultaneously separate from and yet dependant upon the structure of society.
5. Each Negro child must develop personal means of coping with the problem of being Negro in a white society; among such coping mechanisms employed are protest, accomodation, and denial.
6. Current Negro revolt is a statement of self-worth which rejects the general statement of Negro inferiority.

Burchinal, Lee G. and Siff, Hilda. Rural poverty. In Louis A. Ferman, Joyce L. Kornbluh, and Alan Haber (eds.), Poverty in America. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965.

A description of rural poverty.

B.1. Some rural areas are scenes of intergenerational poverty, poor schools, and lack of community opportunity.
2. Educational levels of rural residents still lag a lot behind those of urban residents.
3. School dropout rates are not significantly different between urban and rural populations, but far fewer rural youths continue their education beyond high school.

Chethick, Morton, et al, "A quest for identity: treatment of disturbed Negro children in a predominately white treatment center," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1967, 37, 71.

A descriptive Article.

B.1. Prejudice affects every Negro American's sense of identity; it results in internalized feelings of inferiority, self-hatred, and lack of self-esteem.
2. Prevalent stereotypes laid down by white-dominated society give impetus to the prejudice and hence to the effects of it.
3. In clinical treatment of Negro children, several clear, dominant and repeated ways of reacting to the self-picture created by prejudice, etc. emerge:
   a. There is a period of reacting dominated by hyper-race consciousness in which the child shows special sensitivity,

as if child waits for and anticipates constant "blame" for being Negro.

b. For the Negro child, the ostracism of the wider, white-dominated community lends support for him to blame his problems upon his color.

c. There is also a period of reaction dominated by "color-blindness" in which the child attempts to deny any difference in himself and tries to be like all of the other children in treatment.

d. There is also a period of "loyalty conflict" for the child.

Chilman, Catherine, Growing Up Poor, Washington, D.C.: Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1967.

A review and analysis of research on child-rearing and family life patterns of the very poor compared to optimal child development and family stability patterns (generally middle-class).

A.1. Evidence strongly suggests that the very poor, more than other groups, tend to employ child-rearing and family life patterns that are maladaptive to our society in these areas: mental health, educational achievement, social acceptability, "moral" behavior and family stability.

2. Child-rearing patterns characteristic of very poor families:

a. misbehavior regarded in terms of concrete outcomes, reasons for it not considered, blame projected on others.

b. lack of goal commitment and belief in long-range success; main object is to keep out of trouble.

c. sense of impotence in handling child's behavior and in other areas.

d. discipline harsh, inconsistent, physical with limited verbal communication control largely physical.

e. authoritarian rearing methods with mother chief child-care agent and father (who is often out of the home) largely a punitive figure.

f. low parental self-esteem and sense of defeat.

g. large families, more impulsive, narcissistic parent behavior; orientation to "excitement and abrupt early yielding of independence."

h. repressive punitive attitude about sex, and sex viewed as as exploitation relationship.

i. alternating encouragement and restriction of aggression primarily related to consequences of aggression for parents.

j. distrust of new experiences, constricted life, rigidity.

k. high rates of marital conflict and family breakdown.

l. academic achievement not highly valued and fear and distrust of the school system prevalent.

B.1. It is the poor who appear to employ maladaptive patterns, because middle-class standards are applied to the very poor. Such a bias tends to condemn them to this position, yet for success in our middle-class approaches seem to be more functional.

2. The very poor fail to receive their share of benefits from

the socio-economic system, mostly because of the system itself which has a complexity of limits to free participation in it.

3. The subcultural adaptation to poverty seems to interact with the poverty situation to perpetuate lower-lower class status.
4. Emotional depression may be the prevalent life style of many lower-lower class members and that it has its origins in overwhelming anxiety associated with the almost constant powerful frustrations and threats which surround the slum dweller from infancy to old age.
5. Depressive reactions, confusion over identity and use of various mechanisms for self-expressive escape more prevalent and more pervasive in men of lower-lower class since pressures for obtaining unobtainable occupational success are greater than on the females.
6. The situation of poverty shapes child-rearing patterns that are adaptive to the poverty environment; parental patterns in line with middle-class view of good adjustment might result in poor adjustment to poverty environment.
7. Hypothesized that the more dramatic, expressive, impulsive personalistic life style often found among very poor may be a defense mechanism for coping with overwhelming anxiety related to pervasive hopeless depression form of severe frustrations and rejections. More acceptable and healthier defenses (sublimation, rationalization, etc.) are not readily available.

C.1. It seems necessary to utilize twin programs to
   a. help a large group of the very poor re-adapt its life styles to more effective patterns, and
   b. to concurrently implement massive changes in the poverty situation itself.

2. We need not only enrich educational experience for very young children in low income families but also we need to experiment further with enrichment experience for older groups including adults.
3. Specific intervention strategies that might be tried include expanding services in the "slum school" such as offering school breadfasts, bathing, laundry and clothing services as well as after school recreational and study programs to complement what the parents can offer.
4. Possibly small health, education and welfare units should be set up in such schools as referrals not always possible or carried through.

Cohen, Jerome, "Social work and the culture of poverty," Social Work, 1964, 9, 3-11.

Descriptive Article.

B.1. Lower class is defined as that portion of the population which suffers severe poverty as a result of unstable employment and the lowest paid service and unskilled work.
2. Poverty produces some readily identifiable patterns of behavior.
3. Lower class individuals experience high drop out rates from school; not only because they must help economically but also because the school system is organized around the learning

style of the more advantaged child.
4. The disadvantaged have a relative inability to defer gratification in many areas of their social functioning.
5. The lower-class individual has little opportunity for mastery and mastery's anxiety-reducing function
   a. There are leviant exceptions to the absence of mastery; e.g. being a good delinquent offers a type of mastery and serves to prevent completely damages sense of self-worth for low-income youth.
   b. a sense of shame often accompanies limited sense of mastery and this shame often leads to hostile-aggressiveness of destruction of abilities to trust others.
6. The mere fact of living in poverty leads to questions about self-adequacy and alsot to a questioning of societal values.
7. The "brave front" often seen among this class is protection against a core of depression which is a natural consequence of living in poverty conditions.
8. Betrayed confidence was built on false assumptions.
9. Unfulfilled expectations of love and happiness further lead to self-debasement; the greater the sense of expectation, the greater the anxiety is likely to be.
10. Withdrawal and suspicion are common characteristic behaviors in this class; investing (taking a chance) simply hurts too much.
11. It is extremely important that when offering opportunities for achievement, these opportunities must be offered with carefully planned assistance so as tc maximize likelihood of success.

Cohen, Wilbur J., "A ten-point program to abolish poverty," Social Security Bulletin, 1968, 31, 3-13.

Descriptive Article.

C.3. Quality preschool opportunities are essential for disadvantaged children if they are ever to have the hope of succeeding in regular classroom studies.
A.1. Less than one-third of America's 12.5 million children between the ages of 3-5 are enrolled in nursery schools or kindergartens.
2. The proportion of low income families enrolled is even less than the average.
3. More than 1 million students a year fail to complete HS.
B.1. Unless low-income children have the opportunity to learn and develop skills they will not only be poor children, but will face the high possibility of being poor adults and bearers and rearers of poor children.
C.1. Provide quality preschool opportunities for disadvantaged children; more early learning experiences must be provided for them.
2. There must be improved job opportunities for poor youth as well as programs that will increase their earning capicity.

Dentler, R., B. Mackler, and M. Warshouer (ed.) The Urban R's. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967.

Research.

B.1. The mental style of the disadvantaged according to Frank Riessman is summarized as follows:
a. oriented to the physical and visual rather than the aural
b. content-centered rather than form-centered
c. externally oriented rather than introspective
d. problem-centered rather than abstract-centered
e. inductive rather than deductive
f. spatial rather than temporal
g. slow, careful, patient, persevering (in areas of importance), rather than quick, clear, facile
h. prefers games and action rather than tests
i. has an expressive rather than instrumental orientation
j. follows pattern of one-track thinking and unorthodox learning rather than "other-directed" flexibility
k. uses words in relation to action rather than being word-bound (inventive word power and "hip" language).

C. On the basis of these, Reissman suggests the following for curriculum innovation:
a. adapt the Montessori methods, which have a strong sensory-motor orientation.
b. segregate sexes in early grades, since boys are more antagonistic and their work is poorer.
c. teacher-sponsores: each child sees another teacher for half an hour per week--to talk as a friend.
d. role-playing as central method of instruction.
e. competition e.g. spelling bees, contests, etc.
f. special summer session program especially for those most in need.
g. reading materials using "hip" language as a transitional technique for motivation and stimulation.
h. paper textbooks to own and to mark up.
i. experiment with the new British phonic augmented Roman alphabet.
j. films appropriate for low income groups and for preparing teachers.
k. train guidence workers and teachers in special methods of "learning analysis".

Doverman, Max. "Today's legal revolution: the reformation of social welfare," Social Service Review, 1966, 40, 152-168.

Descriptive Article.

B. Life conditions of poverty and racial containment (non-self-imposed) generate inferiority, hopelessness, frustration, rage and alienation which in turn generate anti-social behavior, low educational attainment, apathy, hedonism, broken marriages, child neglect, unwed parenthood.

Funnye, C, and R. Shiffman. "The imperative of deghettoization: an answer to Piven and Cloward," Social Work, 1967, 12(2), pp. 5-11.

Theoretical.

A. "Separate but equal" schools thesis is fallacious and an impossible achievement.

B.1. The overriding consideration demanding repudiation of Piven and Cloward is the real and dangerous psychological damage created by ghetto existence.

2. Ghetto residents recognize the implication of undesirability and inferiority conveyed by forced separation.

3. "Recent studies" have shown that the quantitative dollar difference between ghetto and non-ghetto schools is insignificant: the difference mainly lies in the ghetto child's lack of self-confidence, which prevents him from finding value in education.

C.1. Rapid and deliberate deghettoization, integration in schools and housing.

Geisman, L.L. and La Sorte, Michael A., Understanding the Multi-problem Family: a Conceptual Analysis and Exploration in Early Identification. New York: Association Press, 1964.

Research study in a New Haven Conn., housing project of 75 lower class families, comparing stable and disorganized families to pinpoint basic characteristics of the multi-problem family.

The "multi-problem family" operational definition is a family with disorganized social functioning with regard to
1. relationships inside the family,
2. relationships outside the family and
3. task performance in areas of health, economic and household maintenance.

Criteria for evaluation are: levels of family functioning rated on a stability-disorganization continuum from adequate (behavior in line with community expectations), marginal (not sufficiently harmful to justify intervention) to inadequate (the community has the right to interven).

A.1. The families show most disorganization and greatest instability in the area of interpersonal relationships, especially among family members, with greater adequacy in the physical maintenance of the family group.

2. There is a general lack of family cohesiveness in the problem family, both between the parents and children and there is a lesser degree of family solidarity.

3. The adequate family is better able to deal with a stress situation in terms of action or attitudes of family cohesiveness.

4. The problem family members appear to have established a set of interrelationships that furthers the disintegrating pattern and removes any possibility of communication and understanding within the family, and leads to inability to perform familial jobs adequately.

5. The problem family group has a smaller total income and is more

likely to be supported by public funds, such as ADC and relief.

6. The largest differences between the two groups are in the area of intra-familial functioning and the individual behavior of family members; items with little discriminatory power included use of church, source of income, physical conditions of the home, informal associations, job situation, and use of community resources (except health agencies).
7. There are factors in the earlier life cycle which may differentiate stable from unstable families: behavior of families in orientation and the early functioning of the families in procreation.
8. The multi-problem families were characterized by an early partnership between the man and the woman, greater age differences, a shorter acquaintance before marriage, more conflict during the acquaintanceship period, more premarital pregnancies, and less realistic expectations regarding married life.
9. Values and expectations of parents differed, with wives of the more stable families having placed a higher children and positive attitude toward pregnancy.
10. Absence of realistic expectations and planning for the future more characteristic of disorganized families.
11. Spacing of births differed substantially with more planning for children done in the stable families.
12. Problem families were found to be younger with fewer of the children out of the home and independent.
13. Multi-problem families are predominantly poor families though it is not a sufficient cause for this deviant behavior.

Gochros, Jean S. "Recognition and use of anger in negro clients," Social Work, 1968, 11(1), pp. 28-34.

B.1. There is no negro of any group who has not been affected by prejudice, and who does not harbor some resentment; it is merely a question of the degree to which hostility is twined into self-hatred, acted out, deliberately disguised, repressed, and/or turned into apathy.
2. If the anger and hate which are there are not recognized and dealt with, they doom to failure the best-intentioned attempts at help.
3. Not only white-negro relationships are affected. If the negro sees the white worker as the "enemy", he may see the negro authority figure as something worse--the collaborator with the enemy.

C.1. It is essential to explore racial attitudes quickly and directly as a general rule rather than as an exception.
2. In discussions, do not demand immediate rationality.
3. If "intellectual" discussion is engaged in, it must be with complete honesty. White should not suggest "understanding" which they cannot, feel a priori. Intellectual discussion is useful
   a. in providing a less threatening opening into an uncomfortable area;
   b. in setting up ground rules.

4. Don't deny the validity of just complaints against the institution.
5. Voicing anger isn't an end in itself, but should be combined with help in changing environment, not just accepting it.
6. There could be no more meaningful demonstration of whites' convictions than to form an alliance with clients that endeavors to undermine elements in the agency or community that prevent them from realizing their full potential.

Haggstom, Warren C. The power of the poor. In Louis A. Ferman, Joyce L. Kornbluh, and Alan Haber (eds.), Poverty in America. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Descriptive Article.

B.1. The poor have a "keen sense of the personal" and the concrete; interests are generally restricted to self, home, and neighborhood.
2. There is a particular stress, among the poor, on the intimate, the sensory, the detailed.
3. Problem of survival is more basic than problems concerning moving up the social ladder.
4. Poor tend to value skills required to cope with deprivation and uncertainty more than skills needed to make progress.
5. Poor are caught in present and do not plan much.
6. The poor have little sense of the past.
7. They find it difficult to delay gratification or postpone satisfaction.
8. The poor hold much envy, hostility, and egotism toward those who have prospered.
9. Outsiders are seen as risky and threatening.
10. The poor attribute causality to external forces.
11. In any rapidly rising industrial society, e.g. U.S. in former period, there typically arises some form of the "self-help" doctrine. Common core of such a doctrine is: a person is seen as good to the extent to which he has assumed responsibility for and completed his potentialities in reaching distant goals; with enough effort anyone is seen as being capable to attain these goals and no special ability is seen as prerequisite.
12. In view of this doctrine, in that anyone given enough time can make it, being poor can have either of two meanings;
    a. poverty was originally regarded as the accompaniament of highest character development;
    b. on the other hand, prolonged poverty might signal a character defect, lack of will power, etc.
13. The poor who became dependent were "inexcusable", (i.e. because of the personal worth of the poor, according to the doctrine) had the dependency seen as a social symbol, communicating defective character.
14. Poverty then, is a situation of enforced dependency, giving the poor very little scope for action, in the sense of behavior under their own control.
15. The dependency of the poor is not primarily a neurotic need to occupy a one-down, dependency position, but rather it is

the result of a deprivation of those minimal social resources, at every period of their lives.

16. Initial social dependency is reinforced by the hardening of a consensus in majority community about the nature of the poor, stabilization of behavior in poverty areas, and partial internalization of ideas and patterns of behavior in the children who grow up in both communities.
17. Some consequences of this social process (dependency creation) include:
    a. poor tend either to retract from, or attack forces controlling their lives over which they have no control and from which they cannot escape.
    b. poor do not accept, totally, definitions of selves from larger community, but develop involved psychological strategies to avoid accepting the definitions.
    c. poor frequently verbalize the values of the more affluent, without practicing them; these verbalizations are useful in protecting self concept and in dealing with the affluent and are not necessarily related to behavior patterns.
18. Poor are normally involved in partly involuntary self-diminuation.
19. The inability of poor to act in their own behalf creates a less complex personality structure for them than is the case with affluent persons with greater linguistic skills.

Herzog, Elizabeth. Is there a culture of poverty? In Hanna Meissner (ed.), Poverty in the Affluent Society. London: Harper and Row, 1966.

B.1. Various often cited characteristics of the poor include:
    a. higher death rate, lower health, poorer nutrition levels, shorter life expectancy.
    b. low education, leading to or associated with low school achievement, inadequate verbal skills, lack of intellectual stimulation, lack of motivation for getting an education.
    c. low educational aspects often associated with unrealistic aspirations.
    d. poor tend to be more authoritarian.
    e. anti- intellectual.
    f. action rather than contemplation oriented.
    g. subjective, concrete rather than objective and abstract in thinking.
    h. less developed imagination and logical powers.
    i. less sense of autonomy and control of their own "fates".
    j. poor are present-oriented rather than future oriented.
2. Author suggests that these attributes are often those which are used to point to or outline the culture of poverty and then points to some qualifications to the usefulness of the concept of the culture of poverty.
3. Desertion, separation, divorce and size of family are varied in frequency inversely with income level.
4. There is evidence that child rearing practices differ according to socio-economic level and that there is an increase in physical punishment practices and riduculing behavior in the lower class segment of the population.

Hunter, David R. "Social problems and social work," Social Casework 1963, 34(9), 503-507.

B.1. Poverty has a dual effect:
   a. Absolute fact of deprivation and its inhibiting effect on every aspect of human development and its entrapment of people in a vicious circle from which escape is almost impossible.
   b. Insidious effect of relative deprivation - being relatively poor in an affluent society. Relative deprivation is one of the prime forces making for deviant behavior and feelings of unjust deprivation have much to do with generating troublesome behavior among the young.
2. Another condition with nationwide dimensions is the failure of the public schools to deal adequately with pupils who are not bound for college.
   a. Public schools have never effectively engaged or educated children from lower class families.
   b. The school system made education an irritant for these children to make unappealing manual labor jobs more pleasant.
   c. The society in its educational system has sorted children into manual and nonmanual groups based on their social class rather than their basic endowments.

Hunter, David R. The slums: challenge and response. London: Free Press, 1964.

B.1. The most important mission of slum schools is to convince slum children that they are a part of America and that they can be successful.
2. It is not sufficient to bring level of education in slums up to an average if dent in problem is to be made.
3. Even if basic educational program content in the slums remained unchanged, more teaching and counseling staff, more room, more materials, and more extra-curricular activities are required.
4. Low educational level of parents often leads to "what's good enough for me is good enough for my kid" attitude; realistically, attitudes may mask embarrassment and fear that the child will surpass parent; attitudes impede childrens' education.
5. Parents often see school as authority over which they have no control.
6. Slum school is often seen as agent of a world that has no entrance.
7. Slum school teachers are often not even familiar with the inside of their childrens' homes, with the environment from which the children come.
8. Teachers in slum schools often less well qualified than others; slum schools are not desirable positions.
9. Teachers are not generally trained to handle special problems of slum schools and slum children, nor are they helped to adjust to a different cultural and value system from what they are used to.

10. 3/4 of the teaching population can be identified as middle class; middle class views and orientations are different from those of slum children; differences can make for communication and acceptance difficulties on both sides.
11. There are a large number of slum children, particularly Negro children, whose families are female-headed; developmental-identification gap is inherited in these situations.
12. The character of the public ghetto; school performance of chi depends not only on his own socio-economic status, but also on the socio-economic characteristics of the school he attends.
13. Racial mix is important for good education; however, lower-class children must have compensatory education as well as mixed class rooms (mixed in the status and color sense).
14. The slum condition or the slum problem has certain elements:
    a. Poverty-relative or absolute.
    b. Rundown housing-dilapidation is not uniform.
    c. Crowding-high occupancy per room, rather than mere density per block.
    d. Concentration of lower-class people.
    e. Racial concentration; increasingly black or non-white populations.
    f. Concentration of persons with low educational achievement, low skill level, and cultural limitations.
    g. Many welfare cases.
    h. Internal mobility-mainly moves within slum, from slum to slum, or to grey area.
    i. Crime-more crimes committed by adults and juveniles.
    j. Health problems-more people in slums are physically and mentally ill; life expectancy is lower.
    k. Broken families: higher divorce rate in slum; often "partial" families rather than broken families in slums due to fact that parents were frequently not legally united to begin with.
    l. Relocation problems-from urban renewal.
    m. Inadequate community services-street repair, policing, garbage collecting, etc. also schooling, health and welfare services.
    n. Isolation and alienation-some merely isolated from main-stream of life; others not only separate from but against, the alienated.
    o. Dirt and fire hazards.
    p. Language problems.
    q. The slum atmosphere-the sum of the above parts-a qualitative factor of influence.

Jeffers, Camille, Living Poor, Ann Arbor Michigan: Ann Arbor Publishers, 1967.

Inferences and conclusions based on participant observation study of families in public housing project in Washington, D.C.

A. Inferences and generalizations based on observations
1. Generally parents who are poor care deeply about the welfare children. They know what they want for themselves and their

children. This includes: better food, clothing, shelter, education, more stable families geared to support, cooperative husbands and fathers and the income to reduce vulnerability to deprivation.

2. A pattern of social differentiation among the poor in public housing is basid mainly on extent to which families believe they have the potential to escape it.
3. Lack of sufficient money and its irregular flow restrict child rearing options and force a continuous rearrantement of priorities among food, shelter, clothing, health, education, recreation and other demands.
4. The family environment of a poor family may fluctuate markedly over relatively brief periods of child-rearing time; opportunities for growth and development may vary markedly among children of different ages and ordinal positions.
5. Speech patterns often vary markedly among children of the same family and there appears to be a lack of concern regarding grammar perhaps because language skills have low priority versus food, shelter, clothing, etc.
6. The lives of parents in many poor families are marked by extreme loneliness, accentuated by awareness of the lack of self-determination and of their disproportionate susceptibility to the unpredictable.
7. Families in the project with the most inadequate and uncertain incomes appeared to have the most extensive communication networks in the projects. These are seen as adaptive networks, essential for survival, which facilitate the exchange of small goods and services among people constantly caught with small lacks.
8. The presumed inability of some poor parents do delay gratification is less a matter of lack of will power, self-control or lower class norms than it is a matter of realistic and rational responses to chronic uncertainty and vulnerability to the contingincies of poverty.
9. The most rejected and frowned-upon problem behavior of many poor parents is less a matter of not knowing better, or of not having the ability to act differently, than it is a matter of (depressed) mood; this mood is critically related to the presence and absence of money with which to satisfy wants (to allow a minimum of self-determination).
10. Many of the urban poor straddle poverty and affluence, exhibiting complex, fluctuating mixtures of the living situations, styles, possessions and tastes of different classes.
11. There are indications that the older child in some poor families is in a particularly vulnerable position--more likely to be isolated in the family and to have a less satisfying relationship with the mother because of the relative absence of play experience, etc.

C.1. Language of the poor is direct and frequently simply so that the problem of communication is in being willing to listen to what is said and to respond with respect and sincerity.

2. Acceptance, access, confidence and competence are important qualities in dealing with the poor, so that not being indigenous may not matter.

Knopka, Gisela, The Adolescent Girl In Conflict, Engelwood, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc. 1966.

This book deals with Mrs. Knopka's acquaintance and interaction with 181 adolescent girls between fourteen and nineteen years of age. The majority of the girls had been adjudicated delinquent and were either in an institution, reformatory, on probation, or on parole. A smaller number of girls (76) were institutionalized, unwed, pregnant girls. Mrs. Knopka states that the unwed girls were more middle class than were the girls adjudicated delinquent. She states that the large part of the girls interviewed were white, (as typical for Minnesota where the study was done), but that there were also Indian and Negro youngsters in the group.

B.1. Every person needs human communication, at all ages; inter-dependance with other human beings is essential to human survival.

2. Most of these delinquent girls come from economically deprived families in which the parents themselves live in frustration; poverty is not only economical but also poverty of knowledge; children are not a "joy" in this atmosphere, but a nuisance, particularly when they begin to assert their need for independance; they are handy for parents to use in ventilating their anger.

3. Many lower-class families are mother-present homes in which the father is absent or was never present.

4. Most delinquent youngsters meet adults as authority figures only and not as individuals also capable of love.

5. Most teachers, social workers, policemen, do not live in the neighborhood with these girls; they are seen as "strangers" with power.

6. To some of these children, the desk symbolizes the powerful, loveless authority; the desk becomes the barrier.

7. Frequently even teachers are so removed from the "real world" of these girls that they are known as "they" and not as figures recognizable in the girls' world.

8. These girls especially resent what they term as the "phoniness" of adults, particularly insincerity, failure to live up to their own preached ideals.

9. Because the authority figure is so removed and unreal, presenting the girls with only demands and restrictions, and not presenting a giving side, the girls retaliate by expecting perfection.

10. These girls hate easily made broken or forgotten promises.

11. Many girls have internalized the feeling of not being wanted to such a degree that they take over the attitudes of those who despise them.

12. Frequently these girls are delinquent in a "passive" form; i.e. they truant, they do not answer questions, they fail grades, they "hang around"; they often infuriate adults because of their remote, unapproachable nature.

13. It is considerably easier for these girls to act in the way they are expected to act, i.e. delinquently, than to attempt to change their behavior.

14. To the girls here considered, the fight against race and prejudice is a personal battle; they are not attached to or or identified with any organization; there is not a sense of "we" rather "it".
15. Many of the girls are not sure of their own attitudes because they do not engage in any sorting out of their feelings or working through conflicts.
16. On the infrequent initial sharing of their feelings, the girls felt ashamed for having done this personal thing.
17. Personal loneliness may "drive" girls to joining a crowd; however, these associations are usually more of physical proximity than any strong form of interaction; being in a crowd assuages loneliness and fear.
18. "So acceptable outlet for aggression, no way to relieve the guilt stemming from behavior they themselves despise, no hope of ever regaining a sense of self-worth, little or no sense of being protected, essential loneliness--all these increase the self-hate. But the destruction process does not stop with this. It is known that people who have little or no self-respect find it difficult to respect others. Hatred turns against other, individuals and groups. The degraded ones find their victims.
19. The behavior of these girls usually leads to rejection by the community, general experience of having no success recognized, increasingly low self esteem, then more behavior which increases the feeling of worthless, vicious cycle.

Kolodny, R.L. "Ethnic cleavages in the United States: a historical reminder to social workers," Social Work, 1969, 14(1), pp. 13-23.

The author suggests ethnic differences should be considered along with class differences.

A.1. Ethnic cleavages have persisted along status lines which remain very similar through time.
2. Rank ordered, ethnic groups fall thus:
   a. Canadians, British, and North European,
   b. Slavic South Europeans, Jews, and American Indians,
   c. Orientals, Mexicans, Near Easterners, and Negros.
3. Groups at the low end of the scale are characterized in terms alien to dominant American values.
4. Inter-ethnic relations have always been characterized by tension in America.
5. Ethnic tensions persist and ethnic awareness continues to play a prominant part in the self-perception of American children.

Kraft, Ivor. "Child welfare services: an essay review," Social Service Review, 1967, 41, 419-427.

B.1. Gains in child welfare services are not purely for the sake of all-out efforts to help country's children; rather they are by-products of technological advances.
   a. Scimping of education results in millions of drop outs and a high percentage of functional illiterates.

b. Refusing to provide comprehensive medical care as a right, results in millions of children with poor teeth, faulty vision, and untreated diseases.
c. Failing to invest a necessary 4 or 5 billion dollars per annum in needed youth services leads to high youth unemployment, wasted talents, 20% of the brighter high school students not going on to college, and a failure to deal adequately with juvenile delinquency.

2. Child welfare services have not only failed to progress, they have backtracked to a pre-depression standard. (Gives example of payments to AFDC families.)
3. America's welfare services are less comprehensive than those of many other industrially developed nations.
4. U.S. is exceptionally laggard in provision of preschool services.

Mayer, Herta and G. Schamess. "Long term treatment for the disadvantaged". Social Casework. 1969, 50(3), 138-145.

Theoretical article with case illustrations as support.

B.1. Characteristics of the "disturbed" child raised in poverty include:
a. He has received in general inadequate nurturing during his early childhood.
b. He is likely to have an extremely poor self-image, to lack ego skills and to see the world as a pervasively hostile, inconsistent environment.
c. He feels rejected not only by his parents but also by the school and the community.
d. His attitude toward an agency is marked by suspicion, discouragement and hostility, especially if he is Negro or Puerto Rican.

2. Negro and Puerto Rican families.
a. Families show a greater tendency to project problems onto the school or community because of the many reality problems in their lives and early emotional deprivation.
b. Families are extremely distrustful of agencies in early contacts due to previous negative experience with welfare agencies, or other government agencies.
c. Often the mother in a very large family cannot remember important details because, overwhelmed by a progression of births, she is unable to individualize her children.
d. Cultural attitudes toward time are also significant and lateness or unkept appointments are not uncommon; often this is passive aggressive reaction to pressure from a punitive authority.

C.1. Such children need to develop trust in another human being which can be fostered by contact with a benign person who can increase the pleasure of learning and establish reasonable educational goals.
2. Child must be given selected life experiences that will increase his sense of ego adequacy and independence.
3. With children with learning difficulties it is advisable to

have the remedial tutor also functioning as the therapist, when the members of the family are unable to recognize or accept emotional problems but are willing to accept the less threatening service of tutoring.

Meeds, Donald E. "The white ego ideal: implications for the heiracial treatment relationship." Smith College Studies in Social Work, 1967, 37, 93-105.

Experimental study regarding the effects on race and social class in aspiring behavior.

A.1. Social class was found to have a significant effect of aspiration while the race of the subjects acting alone did not have such a significant effect.

2. Although the general hypothesis concerning race (that race would have an effect on the level of the aspiration) was not supported, the direction of the aspirations of the over-all class groups was strongly associated with race. This was due to the fact that aspirations were significantly influenced by the combined effects of race and social class. (p.=.001)
   a. while the over-all lower class group aspired lower than the over-all middle class group, the white lower class, considered separately, had very high aspirations.
   b. the mean aspiration score of the lower-class group was depressed by the markedly low aspirations of lower-class Negro subjects.
   c. the extremely high goals of the Negro middle class group elevated the mean aspiration score of the over-all middle-class group, despite the lower more realistic aspiration scores of white middle class subjects.

3. Although the interaction of the race and social class of subjects and the race of the experimenter had no significant effect on aspirations, the combination of the social class of subjects and race of the experimenter had a profound effect (p=.01).
   a. both Negro and white lower class groups had significantly lower aspirations with Negro, than with white experimentors.
   b. the aspirations of the middle-class subjects were not significantly affected by the race of the experimenter. This finding is somewhat illusory since the exceptionally high scores of middle class Negro subjects were grouped tightly around the ideal goal introduced as the maximum score possible. Despite the over-all ceiling effects the scores of middle class Negro subjects were somewhat higher with white experimenters, although not significant to the level of confidence employed in this study.
   c. white middle class subjects showed no shifts in aspirations when confronted by experimenters of different races.

B.1. A white experimenter with lower class white youngsters seemed to confront them with the discrepancy between their real circumstances and their ideal goals. In this setting they strove to attain the ideal; however, as noted above, this led to their holding high, unrealistic aspirations.

2. There is an indication that less pressure may be experienced in setting a level of aspiration (on part of lower class white child) in the presence of a Negro examiner. Lower class whites may attribute greater sensitivity and understanding to Negro worker because of worker's unfavorable social position. While the Negro worker is at some distance from the ideal of the lower class white he may be seen as having greater empathy for the wite's social handicaps. In this situation, the need to compensate for felt inadequacies may be minimized.
3. Lower class Negro youngsters scored low in presence of both white and Negro experimenters; they assumed a defeatest attitude toward their goals. This implies that low initial goals by lower-class NSegro kids may be set with workers of either race.
4. Clinically, lower class Negro clients may fantasy "rescue" by neither the socially impotent real father nor by the abstract, hostile white model. Negro worker, like real father, may be seen as unable, by his own "helplessness" to provide enough. White worker may represent the unattainable white ego ideal. With white worker, the lower-class Negro is confronted by the extreme discrepancy between his position, as well as society's assignment of inferiority to him. Findings suggest that an initial elevation of aspirations may result from client's pretence is necessary with Negro worker because of the projected feelings of low esteem. Since lower class Negro subjects set extremely low, unrealistic goals even when provided with a frame work of success, their situation is singularly tragic. External factors seem to make little difference in terms of a positive influence on th ir willingness or ability to strive toward ideal goals.

Meyer, Carol H. "Individualizing the Multi-problem family," Social Casework, 1963 (5), 44, 367-272.

Descriptive article with recommendations for treatment of multi-problem families.

A. Characteristics of multi-problem families:
1. Main or universal characteristic is poverty.
2. Chronic economic dependency shown in periodic unemployment, indebtedness, inadequate housing, poor standards of housekeeping, conspicuous marital discord, school failure, delinquency, chronic illness, alcoholism, drug addiction (narcotics).
3. Repetition of their difficulties in succeeding generations.
4. Are often members of racial minority groups, newcomers or marginal workers.
5. Are resistant to offers of help from social agencies.

C.1. A large part of answer to multi-problem family is seen in eliminating economic insecurity.
2. Working with multi-problem families does not involve dealing with new clinical entities or "lower-classisms", but requires dealing with universal psychosocial problems exacerbated by poverty, lack of resources and rejection.

3. Families that fail to meet socially approved standards (are deviant in some respect), may be reflecting particular subcultural attitudes or the result of grinding poverty and discrimination.
4. Treatment or working with the multi-problem family must be based on an understanding of the individual family and its pathology as well as directed toward removing obstacles to family's efforts to meet expectations of the community.
5. "Reaching out" to these families is necessary to help them.

Miller, Walter B. Focal concerns of lower-class culture. In Louis A. Ferman, Joyce L. Kornbluh, and Alan Haver (eds.), Poverty in America. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1965.

B.1. There is a substantial portion of America whose values, behaviors and life patterns are products of a distinctive cultural system, the "lower class".
2. Evidence suggests that this cultural system is becoming increasingly distinctive and that the size of the group is increasing.
3. This distinctive, life-style group is characterized by a set of focal concerns, i.e. areas, or issues which are of common concern.
4. Concern over "trouble" is a dominant feature of lower class life.
   a. trouble represents behavior or situation leading to unwelcome involvement with officials and agencies of middle class.
   b. getting into trouble and staying out of trouble represent major issues for males and females of all ages in lower classes.
   c. in middle classes, the major evaluative tool for each other is "achievement" but in lower classes persons are very often evaluated along "law-abiding and non-law-abiding" dimensions.
   d. "trouble-non trouble producing" behaviors are both a basis for defining status, as well as an internalized conflict potential for the individual.
   e. which of the two behavior types valued depends on the person and his current circumstances.
   f. in many instances, there is overt committment to law-abiding behavior but covert committment to non-law-abiding behavior.
   g. "getting into trouble" is sometimes overtly recognized as prestigious, e.g. in groups and gangs.
   h. for a substantial portion of lower-classes, getting into trouble is not in itself considered prestigious, but it is implicitly recognized as a means to other valued ends, e.g. the covertly valued desired "to be cared for" and subject to external constraints, or overtly valued state of excitement or risk.
5. "Toughness" is another focal concern in lower class life.
   a. the lower-class concept of toughness represents a compound of qualities e.g. physical prowess (possession of strength, endurance, and athletic skill), masculinity (symbolized by complex of arts and avoidances, e.g. tatooing and absence

of sentimentality), and having bravery in the face of physical threat. Models for combination of "tough" qualities includes movie gangsters and Cowboys

b. Genesis of intense concern about "toughness" in lower-class life is probably related to fact that many lower-class males are reared in female-dominated households and lack consistent male models with whom they can identify and from whom they can derive the essential components of a "male role". Since women serve as the primary identification object in pre-adolescent years, the almost obsessive concern with masculinity expressed by lower class males is probably a type of compulsive reation-formation.

6. Excitement is a focal concern area for members of the lower-class

a. for many lower-class individuals life rhythm fluctuates between periods of relatively routinized, repetitive activities and sought situations which provide great emotional stimulation

b. many of most predominant lower-class characteristics are related to this search for excitement and thrill

1. Highly prevalent use of alcohol by both sexes
2. Widespread use of all forms of gambling
3. Recurrent "nights on the town" involving a patterned set of behaviors in which alcohol, music, and sexual adventuring are major components.

c. other predominant, characteristic behaviors of lower-class life counter-balance the risk-thril aspect; these behaviors, e.g. "hanging around","shooting the breeze", etc., involve long periods of relativ inactivity or passivity.

c. "a definite periodicity exists in the pattern of activity relating to the two aspects of 'excitement' dimension. For many lower-class individuals the venture into the high world of alcohol, sex, and fighting occurs regularly once a week, with interim periods devoted to accomodating to possible consequences of these periods, along with recurrent resolves not to become so involved again."

7. Related to the thrill quest is another focal concern, fate.

a. there are two ends of this concern, - "lucky" and "jinxed"

b. many lower class individuals feel that they have relatively little control over their lives, that their lives are subjected to a set of forces

c. this "set of forces" is not directly related to the supernatural but rather to "destiny"

d. frequently this often implicit view of the world is associated with a conception of the ultimate futility in working toward the achievement of set goals; failure or success of such goals is predicted on the basis of a projected "fate with" or "fate against" state precluding any effort

e. performance of semi-magical, ritualistic acts is a frequent attempt to change one's luck-unlucky state

f. the exercise of fantasy is prevalent in connection with the fate issue. e.g. fantasied "break" in life, that once

things "start going your way", life will continue to hold good luck for individual; hence the continued effort via gambling, etc. to "make a big killing" absorbs energies and there is little persistent efforts within conventional occupational channels t achieve like rewards.

8. Autonomy is another focal concern of the lower-class
   a. the extent and nature of control over individual's behavior has striking distinction between what is overtly valued and what is covertly valued
   b. overtly, there is frequently expressed resentment of the idea of external controls on individual's behavior, e.g. "no one's gonn' push me around"
   c. in lower-class culture, "authority" is frequently conceptually connected with nurturance; to be restricted or firmly controlled is "to be cared for"
   d. thus, overtly negative evaluation of superordinate authority is often extended to care or protection as well, "I can take care of myself"
   e. actual behavior patterns, however, reveal marked discrepency between expressed attitude and what is covertly valued
   f. many lower-class individuals appear to seek out highly restrictive environments where external controls prevail and are exerted on their behavior
      1. e.g. army, mental institutions, prisons, etc.
      2. while in such environments, the individual constantly expresses resentment of such authority, but upon discharge often seems to appear to try to get back into the environment.
   g. since being "controlled" is equated with being "cared of", attempts are frequently made to test the strength of the authority to see if it remains firm. If authority remains firm, the individual is reassured at the same time he expresses resentment.
   h. this is frequently the situation with "problematic" behavior of lower-class children in schools; their behavior does not comman the coercive controls (from teachers, etc.) implicitly sought by their behavior.
9. Following cultural practices which are essential elements in the lower-class life pattern automatically violates certain legal norms.
10. Where there are both law-abiding and non-law-abiding alternatives forgetting similar rewards, the non-law-abiding avenue frequently offers greater, more immediate reward with comparitively smaller investment of energy.
11. The demanded (or sanctioned) response to certain situations in lower-class culture involves the commission of illegal acts.
12. A large body of interrelated attitudes, behaviors, and values characteristic of lower-class life are designed to support the features of the lower-class way of life.
13. In areas in which these features differ from those of the middle class, action oriented to the achievement of the lower-class life pattern may violate norms of middle class and may be perceived by it as deliberate non-conforming behavior.

14. Non-conforming is not the dominant motivation for the behavior, rather it is lower-class by-product behavior.

Mogulf, Melvin B., "Involving low-income neighborhoods in anti-delinquency programs," Social Work, 1965, 10, 51-59.

B.1. Poor in this society have difficulty obtaining every conceivable thing they need; this difficulty becomes, in effect, the definition of their poverty.
2. The poor, by the nature of their circumstances, are forced into a continuing relationship with public agencies.
3. Society provides legal entitlement to a range of resources, but attached to this legal entitlement are certain eligibility requirements.
4. There are legal means (via eligibility requirements) by which the poor can be cut off from these critical resources.
5. Less easily identifiable, informal ways also exist by which public agencies can divorce themselves from the poor, or short change them in service delivery of resources to which they are legally entitled, e.g. unequal medical care via welfare status; school personnel often treat low-income parents condescendingly; discriminatory housing policies.
6. Disadvantaged who are rejected by public agencies have no other alternative resources; often they do not know how to fight back.

McCabe, Alice R. "Forty forgotten families," Public Welfare, 1966, 24, (2), 150-171.

Descriptive study of 40 AFDC one parent families in East Harlem. (Negro and Puerto Rican).

A.1. Relating to the mothers
   a. 2/3 had been at some time legally married
   b. 3/4 had at least one out of wedlock child, but many of these unions lasted from two and a half to six years--not a "fleeting" relationship indicating not promiscuous orientation but desire for permanent relationship with a man.
   c. few had finished high school but most indicated regret for leaving school.
   d. all had experienced disappointment in men (all were separated).
   e. 60% of mothers and 50% of children had at least one chronic or acute medical problem.
2. Relating to the children
   a. only 14% rated as good on general adjustment in school; absence rate higher than general school population.
   b. projection psychological tests showed poor ability in abstract reasoning, vocabulary, general information, confused sexual identification and marked orality.
B.1. Relating to the mother
   a. Most had an emotional hunger that drove them unconsciously but relentlessly from one unsatisfying relationship to another (which partially accounts for their image as irresponsible and immoral.)

b. Identified material patterns they established with their children as
   1. overprotective--restrictive of childs' outside activities,
   2. underprotective--pushing child to assume responsibilities before he has the ability; generally they are harsh in dealing with the children, yet don't control them;
   3. the sibling mother--is frequently competitive with her children, does not control them.

2. Relating to the children
   a. severe, chronic familial and environmental deprivation and disorganization seen as cause of:
      1. acting out of behavior
      2. poor impulse control
      3. pervasive anxiety
      4. unsatisfactory and fragmented relationships
      5. diminished capacity for learning
      6. lack of self-esteem and negative self-concept
   b. Children often lacked knowledge of family background, make-up, ages, birth places and even their own birthdays
   c. Learned to have constant vigilance and earn money when very young; how to take care of themselves and younger siblings was learned early.

C. Recommendations.
   Without greater intervention for need in increasing funds, budgeting home management, interpersonal relations, dependency problems and parent-child relationships for mothers and children there will be an endless cycle of dependency and defeat.

Parkham, T.M. Jim. "The horrendous facts of poverty" - the culture of poverty." Public Welfare, 1968, 26(3), 193-199.

B.1. Most insidious tendency of poverty subcultures in the production of a pattern of failure in adults and children.
   a. Hope, faith and initiative are replaced by resentment, despair and apathy as events of life in poverty make clear the overwhelming odds.
   b. Public welfare up to now has neither the understanding or resources to break the cycle.

2. It is a mistake to assume the poor have simply a present orientation without regard for the future; the poor think about the future but they have the feeling it will be just like the past.

3. Poor people with meager welfare grants move from one crisis to another--this week the rent, next week no food. They are unable to consume in a consumer economy.

4. The poor spend a higher percentage of their incomes on durable goods such as appliances, radios, television sets, and phonographs because they have the same weaknesses as the rest of American consumers but also use these items to pawn when money runs out.

5. The poor often cannot make economical volume quantity purchases at the supermarket due to:
   a. Lack of available capital to invest in larger quantity
   b. Lack of storage space such as home safes and other posts, and

refrigeration for large amounts of perishables
c. Lack of convenient transportation for this.
6. The poor are more likely to use neighborhood stores where prices are higher but service relationships are more personalized.
7. As poor are generally greater credit risks, those who cater to them generally charge maximum rates.

C.1. Money grants must be raised so poor have more adequate incomes.
2. Less complicated application systems and presumptive eligibility arrangements in public assistance are needed.
3. Public welfare should utilize lower level personnel recruited from client groups and in opening such jobs avoid creating more "dead-end jobs".

Piven, Frances. "Participation of residents in neighborhood community action programs," Social Work, 1966,11(1), pp. 73-80.

A. Characteristics of the Urban Poor which contribute to disorganization and political ineffectiveness.
1. Low income people are overwhelmed by concrete daily needs.
2. Their lives are often crisis-ridden, deflecting from concern with other issues.
3. They often have no belief in their ability to effect the world in which they live.
4. Institutions whose services might offer incentives for low income interest and activity are often effectively isolated from the low income community by their structure, practices, and cultural style.

B.1. The essential dilemma in gaining participation is that participation and influence depend on a wide range of social and economic capabilities.
2. Strategies intended to induce participation may set directions, but sustained and effective participation depends on allocatio to these communities of social and economic benefits that are the resources for participation and influence.

Piven, Frances and R.A. Cloward. "The case against urban desegregation," Social Work, 1967, 12(1), pp. 12-21.

A.1. Demographic trends reveal that negroes are becoming the largest group in the central areas of many large cities, and that whites are vanishing from the inner city.
2. Diverse economic backgrounds may be more important than economic diversity: Mixing middle class students with lower class has a beneficial effect on lower class students and does not diminish achievement levels in either group.
3. Lower class negro schools are significantly inferior to middle class white schools.

B.1. Schemes for providing the best "mix" of middle class white and ghetto children, either busing or "educational parks" are impractical or ineffective.

C.1. Although schools that are racially and economically heterogeneous are probably superior, removing class inequities of teachers and programs is a more realistic goal.

2. Ghetto residents need means to organize separately and a heightened awareness of the distinctive goals to which organizations must be directed. Separatism is a precondition for eventual penetration of ruling circles and achievement of full economic integration.
3. Integration should be understood, not as the mingling of bodies, but as participation in and shared control over major institutional spheres. Communal associations should be developed which are the bases for power, instead of dispensing a community that is powerless.

Piven, Frances and R. Cloward. "Separation vs. integration: a rejoinder," Social Work, 1967, 12(3), pp. 110-111.

A. theoretical answer to Funnye and Schiffman criticism.
B.1. Funnye & Schiffman, in attacking authors for failure to comprehend the demoralization and depersonalization of life in ghetto, join others in contending that the negro community is pathological and negro personality is deformed.
2. Children may not be learning for lack of pride, but surrounding them with whites or submerging negroes in the majority only continues the historical trend whereby negroes saw themselves through white eyes and had their own feelings of personal and creative worth dependent on white feelings.
C.1. Increased black pride, black solidarity, black power.
2. Fight majority prejudice with a strong countervailing ethnic community which can expert power to make negro ghettos as suitable a place to live as white ethnic communities.

Powledge, F., To Change a Child, Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967.

A. A report on the Institute for Developmental Studies sponsored by the anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith on its program for early education of the disadvantaged.
B.1. In speaking of intervention at an early age to make up for cultural lack in home environments, the report points out that some general qualities are necessary in education if success is to be had. They are committment, adventure, patience and courage.
C. "It is our hypothesis that the disadvantaged child needs a specially sequential curriculum, designed to build cognitive skills and improve linguistic and perceptual abilities. This curriculum should be contrived through at least the first three school years in addition to the two pre-school years if the disadvantaged child is to develop the more logical and abstract thought processes needed for learning and academic success. The Institute has been developing a sequenced curriculum which emphasized the development of a positive self concept and a high motivation level."

The last portion of the book demonstrates that such intervention does work as indicated by some statistical data. Hence the author believes that they are heading in the right direction.

Schorr, Alvin. Housing policies and poverty. In Hanna Meisnner (ed.), Poverty in the Affluent Society. London: Harper and Row, 1966.

B.1. The poor person tends to be a block dweller and not to feel at home outside his neighborh od.
2. The poor person's orientation is a product of his background, removing him from this background sweeps away all of this security.
3. One effect of the separation of the housing of the poor from other areas is that some of the poor get the idea that they are being deliberately sealed off from others.
4. The attitudes of the poor are an adjustive response to what is going on around them.

Simon, Arthur, Faces of Poverty, New York: Macmillan, 1966.

A clergyman's account of urban poverty through descriptive analysis of five families.

B.1. The Negro, Northern or Southern, is trapped in a vicious cycle of discrimination in employment, housing and education that locks him in poverty.
2. The poor today have a proportionally smaller share in the nations' wealth than yesterday's poor enjoyed; also, yesterday's poverty was the usual starting point for better things--today it is the dead end.
3. Self-righteous moral superiority of the non-poor prevents us from working for real solutions to poverty and perpetuates myths about the poor that
   a. they are lazy,
   b. don't want to work,
   c. loaf in comfort on welfare,
   d. allow themselves to be dirty,
   e. live in slums, etc.
4. Strength and virtues of the poor often overlooked. Examples:
   a. poor are more apt to be open about themselves than non-poor who are more likely to be prisoners of pride,
   b. are not impressed with formalities or sophistication that tends to obscure rather than reveal persons.
5. The poor today are an isolated minority and thus are treated as politically expendable.

C.1. We must create enough jobs to go around and pay wage earners who support families a living wage.
2. We need much more low income housing that permits the rich and poor to live side by side and not in isolation from one another.
3. We need more educational resources in areas of maximum need (such as inner city areas) and greater integration.
4. We must spend public funds to wipe out poverty, and not just maintain it.

Seily, M., and H. Miller (ed.), Policy Issues in Urban Education, New York: The Free Press, 1968.

A book of readings concerned with current issues with their concomitant controversies.

B.1. A discussion of the instrumental style points out that some prefer the taskmaster style and others the motivational style. Both argue a good case and there is little evidence that tips the scales. A mitigated taskmaster style could be the answer where success becomes the best motivation. A discussion of teacher-pupil relationship hinges on two aspects:
1. that which concerns the teacher as an authority figure, and
2. that which is personal and human.
It is generally agreed the authority must impose a meaningful order for learning. This means order and not regimentation and requires teacher ego-strength and confidence. The personal relationship dimensions are more complicated.

2. The teacher-pupil relationship should not be sentimental but respect for the children and acceptance of the child as he is.
3. The common problem of teacher resentment is discussed and points out a very interesting problem. Teachers are trying for acceptance and style their own initiative and creativity to be accepted in their bureaucratic environment. Hence they lack the courage to allow creativeness in their students.

C.1. What is needed are teachers with courage to be creative and allow freedom of growth in others. This means secure and mature teachers.
2. Suggestions for teacher selection and training are to select those who are already capable of firmness and orderliness and train them to be more sensitive and accepting. This training means totally new methods and development of sophisticated selection devices.
3. Most significant point of debate methods. Two main views are reviewed:
   a. the core should be highly diversified, emotionally and intellectually stimulating experiences.
   b. highly restricted, rigidly controlled training excercises in which the teacher is motivator.

Smitson, Walter S., "The group process in teating culturally deprived psychotics from Appalachia," Mental Hygiene, 1967, 41, 108-114.

B.1. One important characteristic of a disadvantaged person in this country is a lack of participation in group activities.
2. Study has shown that 76% of the disadvantaged strata of the population is completey isolated from formal community association of any kind. e.g. social clubs.
3. The disadvantaged characteristically hold feelings of deep-seated distrust of authority figures.
4. The disadvantaged direct suspicion toward such figures as law authorities, physicians, social workers, etc.
5. The disadvantaged have strong convictions of being exploited and that authority figures are never helpful.
6. They hold the belief that each person has got to "look out for themselves" because no one else will.
7. The disadvantaged are characterized by impulse gratification; they cannot delay immediate gratification for future gain.
8. Few disadvantaged adults have completed the 8th grade.

9. Nearly 50% of wives and mothers in these homes work outside home; this points to possible excessive role confusion.
10. Employment of males among the disadvantaged is irregular and the struggle for existence becomes the central focus of most energy.
11. Family instability is prevalent due to divorce, death, dissertion and/or separation.

Social Service Review, "Rootless children", (in notes and comments) 1966, 40, 309.

B.1. Hundreds of homeless children pass through the courts yearly; some are successfully placed in adoptive homes, others are not.
2. Minority group children are hard to place adoptively and they consequently remain under the auspices of the court and the social agency to which the court has assigned them!
3. Social agencies responsible for these children (at least in the court decision of three children presented in the comments) hold little hope of successfully placing them and seek extended placement for them in foster care homes as the alternative to the difficult task of placing them adoptively.
4. Extended foster care placement means a series of foster homes and a status of being "just one more agency child without a family."
5. The court in this instance was intolerant of discriminatory implementation of placement of children.

Social Service Review, 'The rights of children excluded from school", (in notes and comments), 1967, 41, 306-308.

B.1. In the U.S. school system many groups of children are not given the rights to which they are legally entitled; among such groups is the group of children whose behavior is disruptive to other children and the teacher.
2. The question is raised (in Wisconsin, e.g.) concerning the state's responsibility to provide educational opportunities for, among others, children with behavior and/or learning problems or those who are culturally and socially deprived and sufficiently disruptive to be placed out of the regular classroom.
3. Constitutional interpretation (Wisconsin) is that the school has the right in a reasonable and non-arbitrary manner to exclude these children from the regular classroom; that, however, the local school district must set up special educatory programs for these children in order to compensate for denying these children their fundamental right to attend public school; that failure of the local school district to provide such compensatory programs places such responsibility upon the state.
4. Alternative educational services to children suspended from school are being demanded in some areas, e.g. New York City, by various civic organizations.

a. full knowledge of school suspension is not available because schools have no central records concerning exactly how many children are suspended and for what reasons, and their fate once they are suspended.
b. Suspension procedures: in spite of hearings before school officials, the child is denied due process; there is the assumption that reports regarding the child contain nothing but truths; neither child nor parents are permitted attorneys or other helps useful in presenting the child's side of the case; the possibility that the teacher or system is partly at fault is ignored.
c. suspension cannot be condoned as a substitute for the kinds of services that should be provided by the school system; however, the child often has no educational services or personal assistance after the school drops him.

C.1. Suspension for longer than 5 days should be preceded by a hearing in which the child should be advised of his rights to be accompanied not only be his parents, but also a lawyer, if desired by child or family.
2. That upon suspension, the child be guaranteed immediate, alternative educational services; such services are to be provided by trained personnel.
3. That complete information about suspension should be made available, including reports of what is happening to every child who is suspended.

Thomes, Mary Margaret, "Children with absent fathers," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969 (1), 30, 89-96.

Experimental study of the role of the father in socializing children, using two groups of low socioeconomic status children, one with father present (control), the other with father absent (experimental). All children were Caucasians 9-11 years of age.

A.1. Children in father absent homes more frequently perceived the role activities of teacher, disciplinarian and protector as part of the mother's role, where as the other children (from mother-father families) more frequently viewed this as father's role.
2. Children in father-absent homes made fewer choices of father to carry out parental role activities and more choices of the mother than did the control group.
3. The degree of feeling and attitudinal involvement with the father was much less for the children in father absent homes.
4. There were no significant differences in hostile feelings, either mild or strong, directed toward the fathers who had left the home because of marital discord and the fathers who remained in the home.
5. The most meaningful outcome was the finding of many similarities and few differences between children in the two groups.
6. In a comparison of peer relationships girls from father absent homes more frequently expressed a tendency to act out hostility

and belonged to fewer groups than girls from mother-father families.

7. There is a similarity of perceived self-concept among the two groups.
8. Data failed to support the assumption that boys would be more affected than girls by absence of a father and tended to show the opposite (i.e. girls are more affected).

B.1. In these low socio-economic status families the fathers who were present in the homes did not have a particularly warm or close relationship with their children, so one might not expect the absence of the father to have a very great effect on these children.

Thursz, Daniel. "Social aspects of poverty". Public Welfare, 1967 (3) XXV, 179-186.

Descriptive and critical assessment of the meaning of being poor.

A.1. The article points out the fiction that the poor are inarticulate:
   a. Studies show poor people speak English clearly with directiveness about themselves if not grammatically correct
   b. Failure by professionals (including teachers) to communicate with the poor may be due to desire to "manage" them, not to listen or engage in constructive dialogue.
2. The article points out fiction that poor are cynical, apathetic and hard to reach
   a. Study showed people in one community (in Washington D.C.) though discouraged still felt they could organize and improve the area.
   b. Poor have hope and desire to improve their lot which does not die below the hard shield of suspicion and hostility.
3. The article points out fiction that poor need spokesmen for them
   a. Attempts to have "poor election" systems in 3 cities failed; interpretation was that this was due to labeling participants as poor (not all want to be so considered).
   b. Poor need opportunity to organize and speak for themselves and not official spokesmen appointed by outside agencies or self-appointed.

B.1. It is a fiction that the poor like things the way they are and reject "the Good Life".
2. Poor have middle class reactions of feelings of shame about pregnancy out of wedlock, anger at being abandoned, concern for the future and desire for better life.
3. Rejects fiction of sole solution to problems of the poor (seen as non-homogeneous groups without a separate value system, behaving rationally in their circumstances) and therefore rejects belief that poor need only
   a. power
   b. education
   c. money
   d. professional services
   e. opportunity and jobs.

C.1. Power, education, money, professional services and opportunity and jobs are all needed.

Tidwell, William. "A look at the self-hatred of the negro," New Perspectives, 1967, 1(2), pp. 1-19.

Discussion and review of the literature of the development of negative self-concept.

B.1. Negroes in American society are stigmatized: negroes identify with the stigmates and react to this identification in a self-deprecating way.
2. Successful compensation for the negroe's negative self-concept would be apathetic withdrawal, hostile indifference, or a violent redefinition of values.
3. Negro children internalize the reflection of themselves in the world around them, and that reflection is largely negative. For example, in schools, he cannot identify with predominantly white literature and middle class curriculum, he gets no negro history.

Recommendations:
1. Negroes must recognize they are negroes and be proud of it.
2. But not be incessantly bothered by color. Help individuals develop an identity separate from their color.

Warden, S., The Leftouts, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

This book is an analysis of the disadvantaged child, his background, his school problems and some suggested cures.

C.1. "Cures for a lower socio-economic class background." The author suggests that we must individualize the educational experience. This requires three things:
1. a very thorough knowledge of the child,
2. adequate facilities, and
3. an appropriate method of approach.
This means a comprehensive records system--electronic equipment and the use of modern machine methods. Use of assistants in the classroom is recommended. Preschool programs, compensatory programs, integration of academic and social programs. Teacher training should include group dynamics and exploration of sociocultural differences among children.

2. "Cures for inadequate language facilities."
a. special compensatory programs designed to offer educationally stimulating new experiences which necessitate the employing of language, and intensive training in language development.
b. Electronic devices are helpful and release teachers to develop primary instructional material.
c. Compensatory experiences designed to raise the Leftouts' I.Q. level.
d. Techniques for measuring non-verbal types of intelligence.
e. Small group sessions using simple early tasks.
f. Experiences to teach the skill of attention--encouraged to be imaginative and use language skills often with rich regards.
g. Efforts to foster understanding from advantaged peers.

3. "Cures for deprivations in family affiliations."
   a. foster parental interests e.g. open houses, etc.
   b. nonprofessional aids to work with parents in an open door policy.
   c. more male teachers--therefore salary changes etc.
   d. college and high school student help.
   e. counseling, specialists, coordinators, field trips, and libraries improved.
   f. curriculum contents around student interests.
   g. don't isolate the disadvantaged--peer influence can be important.
4. "Cures for status deprivation."
   a. earlier compensatory measures
   b. small groups--partnerships, etc.
   c. deliberate group dynamics
   d. emphasis on social skills in compensatory training for peer acceptance
   e. extra-curricular activities so child feels he belongs
   f. use of advantaged students as role models
5. "Cures for low levels of self-esteem."
   a. compensatory efforts with help from parents, teachers, peers, etc. Warm, supportive help
   b. counselor visits
   c. small successes go a long way
   d. avoid special classes
   e. get more experienced and effective teachers in these schools, special training of disadvantaged e.g. group dynamics, developmental psychology communicators, etc.

Weinandy, Jane, L. Cary, M. Wagenfeld, and C. Willie. Working with the Poor. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1965.

Report of a three year family consultation service in public housing.

A.1. The housing project manager, the household, and the family consultant (social worker) each indicated a "major family problem."
2. Problems involved family economics 33%, family relations, 22% housekeeping 15%, plus child behavior, health, neighborhood and community problems, illiteracy, and police contact.
3. Families tended to see only one rather than multiple problems. The three judgmental perspectives saw major problems differently, and what was major from one perspective was minor or non-existent from another. e.g. housekeeping was the major problem to management, 5th ranking problem to social workers, and completely absent from the families' list of problems.

C. Useful service techniques:
1. Importance of emotional concern - "caring".
2. Use of active intervention.
3. Directness - clients were confused by subtlety and wanted to know directly what had gone wrong with their situation.
4. Use of a practical approach.

Wright, Mary W. The outskirts of hope. In Hanna Meissner (ed.), Poverty in the Affluent Society. London: Harper and Row, 1966.

A descriptive article concerning Appalachia.

B.1. "It takes time to be sympathetic, to listen, to hear--to understand a human condition.

Young, Wm. Jr. "The case for urban integration," Social Work, 1967, 12(3), pp. 12-17.

A.1. Disadvantaged negro students in schools with a majority of equally disadvantaged white students achieve better than negro students in schools with a majority of equally disadvantaged negro students.

B.1. Segregation by definition means exclusion from any chance to influence society and advance self-interest; thus, segrgation can't be used to build organized "power bases" within the poor community.

C.1. Entrance of negro into mainstream of nation's economic life is a top priority, and integration is a prerequisite.

SECTION III

In this section an attempt has been made to present in more integrated form, the information contained in the abstracts. This has been done by grouping items with similar content under nine major headings. The headings are:

I The family unit
II Negativism toward the poor
III Impact of poverty
IV Behavioral characteristics of the poor
V Inferred psychological characteristics of the poor
VI Characteristics of thought processes and verbal skills of the poor
VII The disadvantaged Negro and other minority groups
VIII Education and the disadvantaged
IX Recommendations for education of the disadvantaged.

In the pages that follow, each set of items is presented in a standardized way. First a number of sub-headings are enumerated and the names of authors whose work is relevant are cited. Then all the sources for that section are listed. Then on subsequent pages appear the details relating to the sub-headings. Each set of items is thus kept separate from the others. Such a separation should not be taken to imply that there is no common ground between them. In fact, the sets of items have been put in an order so that no great difficulty is experienced in passing from one to the next.

I. The Family Unit

A. Definition

Geismar & LaSorte, 1964

B. Sociological Characteristics of the Multiproblem Family

Gesimar & LaSorte, 1964
Bernstein, 1964
Meyer, 1963

C. Psychological Characteristics of Multiproblem Family

Geismar & LaSorte, 1964
Bernstein, 1964
Meyer, 1963
Thursz, 1967

D. Formation and Dissolution of Family Units

Smitson, 1967
Geismar & LaSorte, 1964
Chilman, 1967
Herzog, 1966
Hunter, 1964
Mayer & Schamess, 1969

E. Child Rearing Among Poor Families

Social Service Review, 1966
Konopka, 1966
Geismar & LaSorte, 1964
Jeffers, 1967
Chilman, 1967
Hunter, 1964
McCabe, 1966

Sources

Smitson, 1967.
Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965
Social Service Review, 1966
Konopka, 1966
Geismar & LaSorte, 1964
Jeffers, 1967
Chilman, 1967
Herzog, 1966
Hunter, 1964
Bernstein, 1964
McCabe, 1966
Thomas, 1968
Thursz, 1967
Mayer & Schamess, 1969
Meyer, 1963

I. The Family Unit

A. Definition of the multi-problem family: a family with disorganized social functioning with regard to (1) relationships inside the family, (2) relationships outside the family, and (3) task performance in areas of health, economic and household maintenance. Descriptive terms used in reference to such families: hard-core, sociall delinquent, deprived, hard-to-reach. (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

B. Sociological characteristics of multi-problem families

1. poverty (Meyer, 1963) (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)
2. economic dependency (Meyer, 1963) (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)
3. generational transmission of problems (Meyer, 1963)
4. frequent membership in racial minority groups, newcomers or marginal workers (Meyer, 1963)
5. mobility (Bernstein, 1964)
6. younger families with fewer children out of the home (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

C. Psychological characteristics of multi-problem families

1. interpersonal instability in family (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)
2. absence of family cohesion (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)
3. weakened ability to deal with stress (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)
4. unrealistic expectations and lack of planning (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)
5. projection of blame for problems to outside entities (Thursz, 1967)
6. family distrust of outside agencies (Thursz, 1967) (Meyer, 1963)
7. damaging effect of family instability on children (Bernstein, 1964)

D. Formulation and dissolution of family units

1. multi-problem families experience a shorter amd more conflictual courtship history than non-problem families (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)
2. illegitimacy
   a. more pre-marital pregnancies (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)
   b. feelings of shame about out-of-wedlock pregnancies Mayer & Schamess, 1969)
3. 'partial families' formed without benefit of legal union (Hunter, 1964)
4. marriage
   a. early marriage ages for partners (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

D. 4. b. greater age differences for partners (Geismar & La Sorte, 1964)

c. unrealistic experiences of married life (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

d. high rates of marital conflict (Chilman, 1967)

E. Child rearing among poor families

1. the child's significance for poor families

a. generally, poor parents care deeply for children (Jeffers, 1967)

b. wives of problem families place lower value on children and have a more negative attitude toward pregnancy (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

c. child in poor family is often a nuisance, particularly when children begin to assert independence (Konopka, 1966)

d. child is often a scapegoat for parents' anger (Konopka, 1966)

2. family structure and child rearing

a. one-parent families

i. many lower class families have only one parent, the mother, present (Konopka, 1966)

ii. many slum children, particularly Negro, live in one-parent households (Hunter, 1964)

iii. developmental and identification gaps for the children are inherent in female-headed families (Hunter, 1964)

iv. child's perception of the mother is as teacher, protector, and disciplinarian in female-headed families; these perceptual attributes given to fathers in two-parents families (Thomas, 1968)

v. feeling involvement of children with the absent father is not strong (Thomas, 1968)

vi. girls with absent fathers express more hostility and less group involvement than comparative father-present girls (Thomas, 1968)

vii. girls are more negatively affected than boys by an absence of the father from the home (Thomas, 1968)

b. spacing of children

i. less family planning in multi-problem families (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

ii. with large, unplanned families, mother is unable to individualize the children (Thursz, 1967)

iii. lack of goal commitment in child rearing, with main emphasis on simply 'staying out of trouble' (Chilman, 1967)

2. b. iv. parental sense of apathy in handling child's behavior (Chilman, 1967)

v. harsh and inconsistent discipline, largely physical controlling methods (Chilman, 1967)

vi. authoritarian child rearing (Chilman, 1967)

vii. mother as chief child care agent (Chilman, 1967)

viii. father is perceived largely as a punitive figure (Chilman, 1967)

ix. child is forced into an abrupt and early yielding of dependence (Chilman, 1967)

x. poverty-situated parents exhibit to their children a repressive, punitive attitude toward sex (Chilman, 1967)

xi. alternate and confusing encouragement and restriction of aggressive behavior of children by parents (Chilman, 1967)

xii. constricted, rigid environment for children (Chilman, 1967)

c. child rearing practices of the poor are shaped by and adaptive to poverty (Chilman, 1967)

d. child rearing patterns of the very poor are maladaptive to our society in the areas of mental health, education, social acceptability, and moral behavior (Chilman, 1967)

3. identified maternal patterns (data re: Negro and Puerto Rican mothers)

a. under-protective in that they push child to assume responsibilities early (McCabe, 1966)

b. over-protective of child's outside activities (McCabe, 1966)

c. the mother is often a competing sibling (McCabe, 1966)

4. other factors bearing on child rearing

a. income restricts child rearing options (Jeffers, 1967)

b. family environment may vary markedly over relatively brief periods of child-rearing time such that opportunities for growth and development may vary markedly among children of different ages and different ordinal positions (Jeffers, 1967.

II. Negativism Toward the Poor and Poverty by the Non-poor

A. Discernible in Myths About the Poor

Simon, 1966
Mayer & Schamess, 1969
Parkham, 1968

B. Non-poor Superior Attitude Toward Poor

Simon, 1966

C. Negative Views of the Poor

Simon, 1966
Chilman, 1967
Haggstrom, 1965
Miller, 1965

D. Mechanisms for Perpetuation of Negativism

Simon, 1966
Chilman, 1967
Haggstrom, 1965

Sources

Simon, 1966
Chilman, 1967
Haggstrom, 1965
Miller, 1965
Mayer & Schamess, 1969
Meyer, 1963
Parkham, 1968

II. Negativism Toward the Poor and Poverty by the Non-poor

A. Negativism discernible in myths about the poor

1. myth: the poor are lazy (Simon, 1966)
2. myth: the poor are unwilling to work (Simon, 1966)
3. myth: the poor are loafers on welfare (Simon, 1966)
4. myth: the poor allow personal uncleanliness (Simon, 1966)
5. myth: the poor are satisfied (Mayer & Schamess, 1969)
6. myth: the poor are unable to speak for themselves (Mayer & Schamess, 1969)
7. myth: the poor have no regard for the future (Parkham, 1968)

B. Negativism is expressed in the self-righteous, superior attitude toward the poor (Simon, 1966)

C. Negative views of the poor

1. the poor are seen as politically expendable (Simon, 1966)
2. behavior of the poor is seen as deliberately non-conforming (Miller, 1965)
3. the poor are seen as maladaptive (Chilman, 1967)
4. the poor are seen as inexcusably dependent (Haggstrom, 1965)

D. Mechanisms for perpetuation of negativism

1. the unwillingness of the non-poor to consider the strengths and virtues of the poor (Simon, 1966)
2. assessment of the poors' standards via middle class values and standards (Chilman, 1967)
3. transmission of negative stereotypes to children (Haggstrom, 1965)

III. Impact of Poverty on the Poor

A. Psychological Impact of Poverty

Cohen, 1964
Doverman, 1966
Konopka, 1966
Chilman, 1967
Haggstrom, 1965
Parkham, 1968

B. Impact of Poverty on Behavioral Patterns of the Poor

Simon, 1966
Mogulf, 1965
Chilman, 1967
Schneiderman, 1964
Hunter, 1963
Parkham, 1968

Sources

Cohen, 1964
Mogulf, 1965
Dovernman, 1966
Konopka, 1966
Simon, 1966
Chilman, 1967
Haggstrom, 1965
Hunter, 1963
Schneiderman, 1964
Parkham, 1968

III. Impact of Poverty on the Poor

A. Psychological impact of poverty

1. poverty leads to questioning of self-adequacy (Cohen, 1964)
2. poverty induces a questioning of societal values (Cohen, 1964)
3. poverty results in inferiority, hopelessness, rage and alienation which generate anti-social behavior (Doverman, 1966)
4. poverty creates a state of frustration from infancy to old age (Chilman, 1967)
5. poverty causes hope and initiative to be replaced by recentment and apathy (Parkham, 1968)

B. Impact of poverty on behavioral patterns of the poor

1. the poor fail to receive their share of socio-economic benefits from country (Chilman, 1967) (Simon, 1966)
2. poverty shapes child-rearing practices (Chilman, 1967)
3. poverty enforces dependency (Haggstrom, 1965) (Mogulf, 1965)
4. the impoverished may share a common life style different from that of the general population (Schneiderman, 1964)
5. poverty entraps people in a vicious cycle (Hunter, 1963)
6. deprivation effects all aspects of human life (Hunter, 1963)
7. relative deprivation of being poor in an affluent society is prime force in deviant behavior (Hunter, 1963)
8. poverty produces a pattern of failure in youth and adults (Parkham, 1968)
9. the poor are unable to consume in a consumer economy (Parkham, 1968)

IV. Behavioral Characteristics of the Poor

A. General Behavioral Characteristic of the Poor

Cohen, 1964
Smitson, 1967
Chilman, 1967
Simon, 1966
Hunter, 1964
Mogulf, 1965
Jeffers, 1967
Schorr, 1966

B. Life-Style Behavioral Characteristics

Miller, 1965
Meyer, 1963

C. Value-Related Behavioral Characteristics

Haggstrom, 1965
Miller, 1965

D. Control Seeking Behavioral Characteristics

Miller, 1965

E. Characteristic Behaviors of the Poor in the Educational System

Cohen, 1964
Bernstein, 1964
Smitson, 1967
Doverman, 1966
Herzog, 1966
Konopka, 1966
Meyer, 1963
McCabe, 1966

F. Behavioral Characteristics Related to Legal Norms

Miller, 1965

G. Characteristic Behaviors of Disadvantaged, Alienated, Male Youths

Bernstein, 1964

H. Behavioral Characteristics of Delinquent, Disadvantaged Female Youths

Konopka, 1966

Sources

Cohen, 1964
Bernstein, 1964
Smitson, 1967
Doverman, 1966
Herzog, 1966
Konopka, 1966
Meyer, 1963
McCabe, 1966
Simon, 1966
Hunter, 1964
Mogulf, 1965
Piven, 1966
Parkham, 1968
Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)
Jeffers, 1967
Chilman, 1967
Schorr, 1966
Haggstrom, 1965
Weinandy, Cary, Wagenfeld & Willis, 1965
Miller, 1965
Thursz, 1967

IV. Behavioral Characteristics of the Poor

A. General behavioral characteristics of the poor

1. Interactional characteristics

a. withdrawal (Cohen, 1964)

b. lack of participation in group (Smitson, 1967)

c. limited participation in society (Chilman, 1967)

d. isolation from formal community association (Smitson, 1967) (Hunter, 1964)

e. socially dependent on social agencies (Mogulf, 1965)

f. extensive inter-neighborhood communication (Jeffers, 1967)

g. tends to be block dweller (Schorr, 1966)

h. in dependent relationships with forces controlling their lives, poor tend to retreat from or attack such forces (Haggstrom, 1965)

2. Family behavior patterns

a. child neglect (Doverman, 1966)

b. problematic family relationships (Meyer, 1963) (Weinandy, Cary, Wagenfeld & Willis, 1965) (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964) (Herzog, 1966) (Hunter, 1964)

c. inadequate familial role performance (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

d. early marriage (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

e. less family planning (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

f. physical discipline of children (Chilman, 1967)

f. migrate from rural to urban and are unable to cope with conditions of modern ghetto existence (Bernstein, 1964)

3. Non-categorical characteristics

a. anti-social behavior (Doverman, 1966)

b. partly involuntary self-diminuition (Haggstrom, 1965)

c. crisis-ridden life styles (Piven, 1966) (Parkham, 1968)

d. unstable, interpersonal relationships (Geismar & LaSorte, 1964)

e. performance of semi-magical, ritualistic acts in frequent attempts to change such status (Miller, 1965)

f. indebtedness (Meyer, 1963)

g. poor housekeeping (Meyer, 1963)

h. lateness and unkept appointments (Thursz, 1967)

i. due to cultural attitude toward tiem

ii. due to passive aggressive reactions to pressure from punitive authorities

A. 3. i. irregular male employment (Smitson, 1967)

j. 50% of wives and mothers employed outside home (Smitson, 1967)

B. Life-style behavioral characteristics

1. life rhythm includes both intense excitement and passivity (Miller, 1965)

2. behavioral characteristics related to search for excitement:

a. prevalent use of alcohol by both sexes (Miller, 1965) (Meyer, 1963)

b. widespread gambling (Miller, 1965)

c. recurrent 'nights on the town' with these dominant behaviors: (Miller, 1965)

i. alcoholic intake

ii. musical involvement

iii. sexual adventuring

3. behavioral characteristics related to passivity (Miller, 1965)

a. 'hanging around' behavior

b. long hours of relative inactivity

C. Value-rated behavioral characteristics

1. frequent verbalization of the values of the affluent with practice of these same values infrequent (Haggstrom, 1965)

2. 'trouble' and 'non-trouble-producing' behavior are both a basis for defining status and internal value conflict for individual (Miller, 1965)

D. Control-seeking behavioral characteristics (Miller, 1965)

1. many poor seek out restrictive environment e.g. prison, army

2. express resentment of authority but seek re-entry when expelled from environment

3. being 'controlled' is equated with 'being cared for'

4. when authority remains firm, individual is convinced he is cared for

5. this desire for 'caring control' is rather frequently the case with problematic behavior of lower class child in schools

6. in school, problem behavior does not command the coercive controls implicitly sought by the behavior

E. Characteristic behaviors of the poor in the educational system

1. many drop out (Cohen, 1964) (Bernstein, 1964)

2. few complete 8th grade (Smitson, 1967)

E. 3. low educational attainment (Doverman, 1966) (Herzog, 1966)

4. grade failure (Konopka, 1966) (Meyer, 1963)

5. truancy (Konopka, 1966)

6. diminished capacity for learning (McCabe, 1966)

F. Behavioral characteristics related to legal norms (Miller, 1965)

1. frequent overt commitment to law-abiding behavior and covert commitment to non-law-abiding behavior

2. legal and illegal behavioral alternatives simultaneously present for like ends yields a choice of the illegal behavioral alternative because it offers more immediate reward with less expansion of energy

3. the demanded (or sanctioned) response to certain situations in lower-class culture involves the commission of illegal acts.

G. Characteristic behaviors of disadvantaged, alienated male youths (Bernstein, 1964)

1. high drop out rate

2. 'big talk' behavior in attempt to hide poor self-confidence

3. frequent trouble with police

4. frequent drinking and drug use

5. irregular employment

6. fathering illegitimate children

7. street dwelling

8. difficult maturational process

9. bizarre dress which is identity outlet

10. outwitting behavior as behavioral asset

11. poor work habits and ineptness in job finding and performance

H. Behavioral characteristics of delinquent, disadvantaged female youths (Konopka, 1966)

1. 'hanging around' behavior

2. refusal to respond to questions

3. failure to consider things objectively

4. crowd or group association

V. Inferred Psychological Characteristics of the Poor

A. Characteristics Relevant to the General Disadvantaged Population (without Specific Referencetto Age or Racial Groups)

Cohen, 1964
Smitson, 1967
Haggstrom, 1965
Piven, 1966
Chilman, 1967
Herzog. 1966
Schneiderman, 1964
Mayer & Schamess, 1969
Thursz, 1967
Parkham, 1968

B. Characteristics of Poor Adults (without Special Reference to Sex or Race)

Jeffers, 1967
Chilman, 1967
Schorr, 1966

C. Characteristics of the 'Disturbed' Child Reared in Poverty

Mayer & Schamess, 1969

D. Characteristics Relevant to Alienated-Disadvantaged Youths (with Reference to Specific Racial Groups Noted)

Konopka, 1966
Bernstein, 1964

Sources

Cohen, 1964
Smitson, 1967
Haggstrom, 1965
Piven, 1966
Chilman, 1967
Herzog, 1966
Schneiderman, 1964
Mayer & Schamess, 1969
Thursz, 1967
Parkham, 1968
Jeffers, 1967
Schorr, 1966
Konopka, 1966
Bernstein, 1964

V. Inferred Psychological Characteristics of the Poor

A. Characteristics relevant to the general disadvantaged population (without specific age or racial references)

1. no access to anxiety reducing mastery (Cohen, 1964)
2. a sense of shame from betrayed trust in others (Cohen, 1964)
3. a sense of self-debasement from unfulfilled love and happiness expectations (Cohen, 1964)
4. distrust of authority figures (Smitson, 1967)
5. suspicion of authority figures (Smitson, 1967) (Cohen, 1964)
6. conviction of being exploited (Smitson, 1967)
7. belief they must 'look out for themselves' (Smitson, 1967)
8. impulse gratification tendency (Smitson, 1967)
9. inability to delay immediate gratification for future gain (Smitson, 1967) (Cohen, 1964) (Haggstrom, 1965)
10. 'overwhelmed' state due to daily needs (Piven, 1966)
11. depression (Chilman, 1967)
12. anxiety (Chilman, 1967)
13. subjective orientation (Herzog, 1966)
14. diminished sense of autonomy and control of fate (Herzog, 1966) (Piven, 1966)
15. present-time orientation (Herzog, 1966) (Haggstrom, 1965) (Schneiderman, 1964)
16. a sense for the personal (Haggstrom, 1965)
17. a stress on the intimate (Haggstrom, 1965)
18. survival orientation rather than a socially progressive orientation (Haggstrom, 1965)
19. little sense of past (Haggstrom, 1965)
20. hostility toward the prosperous (Haggstrom, 1965)
21. suspicion of outsiders as threatening and risky (Haggstrom, 1965)
22. projection of causality to external forces (Haggstrom, 1965)
23. concern for the future (Mayer & Schamess, 1969) (Thursz, 1967) (Parkham, 1968)
24. resentment (Parkham, 1968)
25. apathy in face of overwhelming odds (Parkham, 1968)

B. Characteristics of poor adults

1. extreme loneliness (Jeffers, 1967)
2. awareness of lack of self-determination (Jeffers, 1967)
3. awareness of susceptability to unpredictables (Jeffers, 1967)

B. 4. feeling of constant vulnerability (Jeffers, 1967)
5. chronic uncertainty (Jeffers, 1967)
6. depression (Jeffers, 1967)
7. a sense of impotence in child rearing (Chilman, 1967)
8. distrust of new experiences (Chilman, 1967)
9. low self-esteem (Chilman, 1967)
10. sense of defeat (Chilman, 1967)
11. excitement orientation (Chilman, 1967)
12. identity confusion (Chilman, 1967)
13. attitudes adjustive to situation (Schorr, 1966)

C. Characteristics of disturbed child reared in poverty (Mayer & Schamess, 1969)
1. extremely poor self image
2. deficiency in ego skills
3. view of the world as pervasively hostile
4. feeling of being rejected by parents, school and community

D. Characteristics relevant to alienated, disadvantaged youth (with specific racial references included)
1. the disadvantaged female youth, adjudicated delinquent (Konopka, 1966)
a. internalized feeling of rejection
b. shame in initial expression of personal feelings
c. personal loneliness
d. guilt stemming from their own behavior
e. negative sense of self-worth
f. self-hatred
g. resentment of adult 'phoniness' and adult failure to live up to preached ideals
h. hatred of easily made and broken or forgotten promises
i. expectation of perfection in authoritative adults
2. the disadvantage male youth, hostile and alienated (data referent to minority group youngsters, primarily Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American (Bernstein, 1964)
a. intolerance for 'pretty speeches'
b. envy of middle class rewards
c. damaged sense of self-worth
d. sense of rejection by 'respectable' world
e. fear of being rejected

D. 2. f. security in group aggression

g. low impulse control

h. weak in ability to anticipate consequences of their behavior

i. 'craving' for excitement

j. influenced by specific and concrete

k. distrustful of any but tangible evidence

l. projection of shame

m. low self-esteem

n. confused sexual identification

o. lack of self-confidence

p. low tolerance for authority

q. unrealistic perceptions

VI. Characteristics of Thought Processes and Verbal Skills of the Poor

A. Thought Processes

McCabe, 1966
Herzog, 1966
Bernstein, 1964
Haggstrom, 1965

B. Verbal Patterns

Bahal, Madaus & Winder, 1968
Herzog, 1966
Jeffers, 1967
Haggstrom, 1965
Hunter, 1964
Thursz, 1967

Sources

Bahal, Madaus & Winder, 1968
Herzog, 1966
Jeffers, 1967
Haggstrom, 1965
Hunter, 1964
Thursz, 1967
McCabe, 1966
Bernstein, 1964

VI. Characteristics of the Verbal Patterns and Thought Processes of the Poor

A. Thought processes

1. poor ability in abstract reasoning (McCabe, 1966)
2. diminished capacity for learning (McCable, 1966)
3. lack of intellectual stimulation (Herzog, 1966)
4. subjective-concrete rather than objective-abstract thinking (Herzog, 1966) (Bernstein, 1964)
5. less developed imaginative and logical powers (Herzog, 1966)
6. stress on the sensory and the detailed (Haggstrom, 1965)

B. Verbal patterns

1. low capacity for verbalization and self-expression (Bahal, Madaus & Winder, 1968) (Herzog, 1966)
2. lack of concern with grammar due to other, higher in priority concerns (Jeffers, 1967)
3. speech patterns often vary among children of same family (Jeffers, 1967)
4. limited linguistic skills (which contribute to less developed personality (Haggstrom, 1965)
5. language problems are characteristic of the slum (Hunter, 1964)
6. the poor as inarticulate is a fiction; their English is direct and clear, if not grammatically correct (Thursz, 1967)

VII. The Disadvantaged Negro (With Selected Comments Applicable to Other Minority Populations)

A. Discrimination Toward the Disadvantaged Negro

Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965
Simon, 1966

B. Prejudice

Chethick, 1967
Gochros, 1966
Tidwell, 1967
Bernstein, 1964
Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965

C. Segregation & Separation of the Negro.

Young, 1967
Funnye & Shiffman, 1967
Billingsley & Billingsley

D. Sociological Features of Disadvantaged Negro's Position in Society

Kolodny, 1969
Hunter, 1964
Piven & Cloward, 1967b

E. The Disadvantaged Negro Child

Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965
Chethick, 1967
Tidwell, 1967
Funnye & Shiffman, 1967
Social Service Review, 1966
Kolodny, 1969

F. Disadvantaged Minority Group Youth and the Racial-Equality Movement

Bernstein, 1967
Konopka, 1966

G. Characteristics of the Disadvantaged, Minority Group Female

McCabe, 1966

Sources

Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965
Simon, 1966
Gochras, 1966
Bernstein, 1964
Young, 1967
Funnye & Shiffman, 1967
Kolodny, 1969
Piven & Cloward, 1967b
Hunter, 1964
Social Service Review, 1966
Konopka, 1966
Chethick, 1967
Tidwell, 1967
Bernstein, 1967
McCabe, 1966

VII. The Disadvantaged Negro (With Selected Comments Applicable to Other Minority Populations

A. Discrimination of the disadvantaged Negro

1. northern discrimination is inability to grasp the need for special community efforts to overcome pervasive poverty, social isolation and psychological alienation in the Negro ghetto (Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965)
2. southern discrimination is more an effort to discriminate and deprive the Negro of opportunities (Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965)
3. the Negro in all of the U.S. is trapped in a vicious cycle of discrimination in employment, housing, and education (Simon, 1966)

B. Prejudice

1. prejudice effects every Negro American's sense of identity (Chethick, 1967)
2. prejudice results in internalized feelings of inferiority, self-hatred, and lack of self-esteem (Chethick, 1967)
3. prevalent stereotypes established by white-dominated society give impetus to prejudice (Chethick, 1967)
4. no Negro of any group has escaped the effect of prejudice (Gochros, 1966)
5. no Negro is without resentment which prejudice induces; it is merely a question of the degree to which hostility is: (Gochros, 1966)
   a. made into self-hatred
   b. acted out
   c. deliberately disguised
   d. repressed
   e. turned into apathy
6. the Negro American in our society is stigmatized; identifies with the stigmates, and reacts to this identification in a self-deprecating way (Tidwell, 1967)
7. negative attributes often pinned to Negroes are more often a result of poverty than of color (Bernstein, 1964)
8. Negroes compensate for their negative self-concept (induced by prejudice in varying ways: (Tidwell, 1967)
   a. apathetic withdrawal
   b. hostile indifference
   c. violent redefinition of values
9. crippling handicap of American Negro is a deep-seated sense of inferiority (Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965)

C. Segregation and separation of the Negro

1. segregation means an exclusion from any chance to influence society and advance self-interest (Young, 1967)

2. ghetto residents recognize the implication of undesirability and inferiority conveyed by forced separation (Funnye & Shiffman, 1967)

3. the American Negro is simultaneously separate from and dependent upon the structure of society (Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965)

D. Sociological features of the Negro's position in society

1. Negroes occupy the bottom position in ethnic rankings (Kolodny, 1969)

2. Negroes rapidly becoming predominant group in the central areas of many cities (Piven & Cloward, 1967b) (Hunter, 1964)

E. The Negro Child

1. Negro child's problems in identification (Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965)

a. Negro child cannot identify with authority figures and positions of power and influence

b. Negro child's efforts to deal with autonomy crisis are severely restricted due to problems in identification

c. the relative absence of role models occupying major positions in the crucial institutions of society presents difficulties for the Negro families who would 'have their child be somebody'

2. the impact of being Negro on the Negro child

a. each Negro child must develop personal means of coping with the problem of being Negro in a white society. Among such means: (Billingsley & Billingsley, 1965)

i. protest

ii. accommodation

iii. denial

b. the Negro child has been seen to react to his self-picture, created by prejudice, in clear and repeated ways (Chethick, 1967)

i. hyper-race-consciousness, characterized by an especial sensitivity and an anticipation of constant blame for being Negro

ii. color blindness during which child denies any difference in himself and tries to be like all other kids

iii. loyalty conflict for the child

c. Negro children internalize the largely negative

reflections of themselves present in their environment (Tidwell, 1967)

d. the ghetto child lacks self-confidence (Funnye & Shiffman, 1967)

e. for the Negro child, the ostracism of the wider, white-dominated community lends support for his projecting blame for his problems onto his color (Chethick, 1967)

f. ethnic awareness continues to play a prominent part in the self-perception of American children (Kolodny, 1969)

g. minority children, abandoned or deprived of parents, are difficult to place adoptively and become agency children without families (Social Service Review, 1966)

F. Disadvantaged minority youth and the racial equality movement (Bernstein, 1967)

1. limited belief in the civil rights movement
2. little faith in change via social action
3. non-acceptance of non-violent theme
4. heightened racial sensitivity, suspicion and anger
5. little impact upon them by anti-poverty program
6. deep cynicism about the system and their future
7. disadvantaged girls have personal fight against prejudice and are unaligned with any particular organization (Konopka, 1966)

G. The disadvantaged minority-group female (McCabe, 1966)

1. often are legally married at one time
2. many have had at least one child out of wedlock
3. illegitimate children conceived in unions lasting from 2-6 years
4. few finish high school, but leave reluctantly
5. chronic or acute medical problems are prevalent

VIII. Education and the Disadvantaged

A. The Slum School

Hunter, 1964
Funnye & Shiffman, 1967

B. The Disadvantaged Child's View of Education

Funnye & Shiffman, 1967
Bernstein, 1964
Konopka, 1966
Bahal, Madaus & Winder, 1968

C. The Poor Parent's Attitudes toward the Educational Process

Chilman, 1967
Hunter, 1964

D. The Teacher and the Disadvantaged

Konopka, 1966
Hunter, 1964
Thursz, 1967

E. Value Orientation of Teachers and Disadvantaged Populations

Schneiderman, 1964
Hunter, 1964
Konopka, 1966

F. Characteristics of the Disadvantaged Child Relevant to School Performance

McCabe, 1966
Herzog, 1966

G. Integration and Learning Among the Disadvantaged

Piven & Cloward, 1967a and 1967b
Tidwell, 1967
Hunter, 1964
Young, 1967

H. The Drop-Out Problem

Bernstein, 1964
Cohen, 1964 and 1968
Kraft, 1967

I. Society and Educating the Disadvantaged

Kraft, 1967
Cohen, 1968
Social Service Review, 1967
Bernstein, 1964
Hunter, 1963
Mayer & Schamess, 1969

Sources

Cohen, 1964 and 1968
Kraft, 1967
Pernstein, 1964
Piven & Cloward, 1967a and 1967b
Tidwell, 1967
Hunter, 1963 and 1964
Young, 1967
Konopka, 1966
Thursz, 1967
Social Service Review, 1967
Mayer & Schamess, 1969
Chilman, 1967
Funnye & Shiffman, 1967
Bahal, Madaus & Winder, 1968
Schneiderman, 1964
McCabe, 1966
Herzog, 1966

VIII. Education and the Disadvantaged

A. The slum school

1. not sufficient to bring level of slum education up to average; it must be higher than average to effect the problem (Hunter, 1964)

2. even if basic educational program remains the same, there must be more teachers, counselors, rooms, materials, and extra-curricular activities (Hunter, 1964)

3. school performance of a child depends not only on his own socio-economic characteristics but also on the socio-economic characteristics of the school in which he is (Hunter, 1964)

4. the most important mission of slum schools is to convince slum school children that they can be successful (Hunter, 1964)

5. quantitative dollar difference between ghetto and non-ghetto schools is insignificant (Funnye & Shiffman, 1967)

B. The disadvantaged child's view of education

1. education's value for the child

a. difference between ghetto and non-ghetto schools is in the ghetto child's lack of self-confidence which prevents his finding value in education (Funnye & Shiffman, 1967)

b. education is not seen as desirable by alienated, hostile youth (Bernstein, 1964)

c. education intrinsically lacks appeal for alienated youth (Bernstein, 1964)

d. education is seen as a 'way out' but too dull to have ends justify means (Bernstein, 1964)

2. child's view of the school system

a. negative feelings due to repeated failure (Bernstein, 1964)

b. desk symbolizes loveless authority and is barrier between teacher and student (Konopka, 1966)

c. school is scene of failure (Bernstein, 1964)

3. problem areas in motivating the disadvantaged child toward education goals (Bahal, Madaus, & Winder, 1968)

a. negative attitude and alienation

b. low capacity for verbalization and self-expression

c. lack of role models for educational goals

C. The poor parent's attitudes toward the educational process

1. attitudes held toward the school system

a. fear and distrust of school system prevalent

b. disadvantaged parent often sees the school as an authority over which he has no control (Hunter, 1964)

2. attitudes toward education

a. academic achievement not highly valued among the very poor (Chilman, 1967)

b. low education level of parents often leads to a 'what's good enough for me is good enough for my kid' attitude which impedes a child's education (Hunter, 1964)

c. disadvantaged parent may feel embarrassment about lack of education and fear his child's surpassing him (Hunter, 1964)

D. The teacher and the disadvantaged

1. the teacher as alien

a. most teachers of disadvantaged live outside the school neighborhood and are often viewed as strangers with power (Konopka, 1966)

b. teachers do not know kids' environment (Hunter, 1964) (Konopka, 1966

2. the teacher as unprepared to teach the disadvantaged

a. teachers are not trained to handle special problems of slum school setting and slum children (Hunter, 1964)

b. teachers are not helped to adjust to differences in their own and their children's cultural and value system (Hunter, 1964)

c. failure by professionals (teachers) to communicate with the poor may be due to a desire to manage the children rather than to engage them (Thursz, 1967)

E. Value orientation of teacher and disadvantaged populations

1. value differences between teachers and the impoverished (Schneiderman, 1964) (Hunter, 1964)

a. teachers prefer a 'mastery over nature' value orientation while impoverished demonstrated equal preferences for 'harmony with nature' and 'subjugation to nature' value orientations

b. teachers showed significant preference for 'future-time' value orientation while the impoverished showed value preferences for 'present-time' orientation

c. teacher preferred a 'doing' human activity modality value orientation

d. teachers engaged in teaching the disadvantaged may be engaged in an inter-cultural enterprise and may expect problems: (Schneiderman, 1964) (Konopka, 1966)

i. in communication

ii. in joint goal setting efforts

2. teachers and the impovereished begin from different first assumptions about life and its major organizing values (Schneiderman, 1964)

3. 3/4 of the teaching population is middle class (Hunter, 1964)

F. Characteristics of the disadvantaged child relevant to school performance

1. characteristics relevant to children of one-parent families (McCabe, 1966)

a. low percentage rate 'good' on general adjustment in school

b. higher than average absence rate

c. poor ability in abstract reasoning, vocabulary and general information

2. some commonly assumed characteristics (Herzog, 1966)

a. low educational level and achievement

b. inadequate verbal skills

c. inadequate intellectual stimulation

d. lack of motivation for education

G. Integration and learning among the disadvantaged

1. racial integration in the school

a. integration of poor whites and poor Negroes does not improve levels in either group (Piven & Cloward, 1967b)

b. lower class Negro schools are significantly inferior to middle class white schools (Piven & Cloward, 1967b)

c. the Negro child cannot identify with the predominantly white literature and middle class curriculum (Tidwell, 1967)

d. racial mix is important for good education (Hunter, 1964)

e. the Negro child surrounded by whites in school setting perpetuates the Negro child's forming an image of self through white eyes (Piven & Cloward, 1967a)

f. disadvantaged Negro students in schools with a majority of equally disadvantaged white students achieve better than Negro students in schools with a majority of equally disadvantaged Negro students (Young, 1967)

g. lower-class children must have compensatory education programs as well as racially mixed classes (Hunter, 1964)

2. socio-economic integration in the schools

a. mixing middle class students with lower class students has a beneficial effect on the lower class students and does not diminish level of achievement of the middle class children (Piven & Cloward, 1967b)

b. schemes for providing best economic mix of middle class and ghetto children are impractical and ineffective (Piven & Cloward, 1967b)

H. The drop-out problem

1. the drop-out rate

a. lower class individuals experience high drop-out rate (Cohen, 1964)

b. more than 1,000,000 youths fail to complete 8th grade each year (Cohen, 1968)

2. some causal elements of drop-out among the disadvantaged

a. drop-out is due partially to economic necessity (Cohen, 1964)

b. drop-out rate is related to the fact that the school system is organized around the learning style of the more affluent child (Cohen, 1964)

c. scrimping of educational appropriations results in high drop-out rates (Kraft, 1967)

d. the behavior of hostile, alienated youth often leads them to become 'pushouts' as much as drop-outs (Bernstein, 1964)

I. Society and educating the disadvantaged

1. the effect on society of inadequately educating the disadvantaged

a. educational scriping contributes to functional illiteracy (Kraft, 1967)

b. absence of the opportunity to learn and develop skills means that disadvantaged children face being poor adults and the bearers of poor children (Cohen, 1968)

2. the disadvantaged in society's educational system

a. in U.S. school system, many children are not given their legal rights with regard to alternatives to public schooling and with regard to suspension procedures (Social Service Review, 1967)

b. sub-lower and minority youngsters have no access to or cannot effectively utilize educational opportunities to achieve personal satisfactional and status (Bernstein, 1964)

c. public school system has never effectively engaged or educated lower class children (Hunter, 1963)

d. society has educationally sorted children into manual and non-manual broups based on their social class rather than their basic endowment (Hunter, 1963)

e. the disadvantaged child feels rejected by school system (Mayer & Schamess, 1969)

IX. Recommendations Relevant to Educating the Disadvantaged and for Improving their Situation

A. Education

Cohen, 1968
Funnye and Shiffman, 1967
Piven and Cloward, 1967b
Simon, 1966
Bernstein, 1967
Chilman, 1967
Bernstein, 1969
Thursz, 1967
Social Service Review, 1967

B. Job Opportunities

Cohen, 1968
Simon, 1966
Bernstein, 1967
Parkham, 1968

C. Housing

Funnye and Shiffman, 1967
Simon, 1966
Bernstein, 1967

D. Income Stabilization

Bernstein, 1967
Meyer, 1963
Parkham, 1968

E. Techniques for Working with the Disadvantaged

Cohen, 1964
Bernstein, 1964
Weinandy et al, 1965
Jeffers, 1967
Wright, 1966
Thursz, 1967
Meyer, 1963
Gochras, 1966

F. For Improvement of the Black Position

Piven and Cloward, 1967a and 1967b
Tidwell, 1967
Simon, 196[illegible]

G. Miscellaneous

Bernstein, 1967
McCabe, 1966

Sources

Cohen, 1964 and 1968
Simon, 1966
Bernstein, 1967
Parkham, 1968
Bernstein, 1964
Funnye and Shiffman, 1967
Piven and Cloward, 1967a and 1967b
Chilman, 1967
Thursz, 1967
Social Service Review, 1967
Meyer, 1963
Weinandy et al, 1965
Jeffers, 1967
Wright, 1966
Gochras, 1966
Tidwell, 1967
McCabe, 1966

IX. Recommendations Relevant to Educating the Disadvantaged and for Improving their Situation

A. Education

1. quality pre-school program for poor children (Cohen, 1968)
2. rapid school integration (Funnye and Shiffman, 1967)
3. removal of inequalities of teachers and programs in ghetto schools (Piven and Cloward, 1967b)
4. more educational resources into inner city (Simon, 1966) (Bernstein, 1967)
5. smaller classes for the poor (Bernstein, 1967)
6. teachers dedicated to the slum child (Bernstein, 1967)
7. flexible and imaginative administration in ghetto schools (Bernstein, 1967)
8. more social workers in ghetto schools (Bernstein, 1967)
9. ghetto residents as leader aides in ghetto schools (Bernstein, 1967)
10. more curriculum adapted to needs of alienated children (Bernstein, 1967)
11. divided educational experience for very young children in low-income families (Chilman, 1967)
12. experimentation for enrichment programs for the older poor (Chilman, 1967)
13. expanded school services in slum schools (Chilman, 1967)
14. curriculum which makes sense to poor kids (Bernstein, 1964)
15. interpretation of personalities and problems of ghetto children to school administrators (Bernstein, 1964)
16. adequate study places for poor children (Bernstein, 1964)
17. remedial tutors for children with learning difficulties (Thursz, 1967)
18. appropriate suspension procedures for low-income children with behavioral problems (Social Service Review, 1967)
19. good relationships for learning problem-poor children in which the increase pleasure in learning (Thursz, 1967)
20. prevention of the attitudes of hopelessness in either the teachers of students in ghetto children (Bernstein, 1967)

B. Job opportunities

1. improved job opportunities for youth and programs which will increase their earning capacity (Cohen, 1968)
2. more and better jobs, rather than just training for existing jobs (Simon, 1966) (Bernstein, 1967)
3. adequate living wages (Simon, 1966)

4. public work programs with on the job training (Bernstein, 1967)
5. increased hiring by private businesses of ghetto youth (Bernstein, 1967)
6. ghetto youth in community service jobs (Bernstein, 1967)
7. low-income personnel in public welfare (Parkham, 1968)
8. avoid hiring poor into 'dead end' jobs (Parkham, 1968)

C. Housing

1. rapid integration in housing (Funnye and Shiffman, 1967)
2. more low-income housing (Simon, 1966)
3. improved living conditions (Bernstein, 1967)

D. Income stabilization

1. income increases for the poor (Bernstein, 1967)
2. guaranteed annual income (Bernstein, 1967)
3. elimination of economic insecurity (Meyer, 1963)
4. larger assistance grants (Parkham, 1968)
5. less complicated assistance application systems (Parkham, 1968)

E. Techniques for working with the disadvantaged

1. providing opportunities for achievement which have carefully planned assistance for maximizing likelihood of success (Cohen, 1964)
2. specific alternatives to anti-social behavior (Bernstein, 1964)
3. emotional concerns and 'caring' (Weinandy et al, 1965)
4. directness rather than subtlety (Weinandy et al, 1965)
5. practical approaches (Weinandy et al, 1965)
6. willingness to listen and respond with respect (Jeffers, 1967)
7. acceptance access, confidence and competence (Jeffers, 1967)
8. time for sympathetic understanding (Wright, 1966)
9. concreteness (Bernstein, 1964)
10. patience, faith and skill (Bernstein, 1964)
11. distinction between bad behavior's unacceptability and acceptability of the person (Bernstein, 1964)
12. utilization of crisis to teach alternative behavior (Bernstein, 1964)
13. rewarding restraint (Bernstein, 1964)
14. abiding interest (Bernstein, 1964)
15. support (Bernstein, 1964

16. providing selected life experience to poor children to increase their sense of ego-adequacy (Thursz, 1967)
17. an understanding of individual families (Meyer, 1963)
18. 'reaching out' (Meyer, 1963)
19. when whites attempt to help blacks (Gochros, 1966)
    a. quick, direct explanation of social attitudes
    b. no demand in discussion for immediate rationality
    c. acknowledge validity of just complaints
    d. help ventilation of anger
    e. help to change environment rather than accept it.

F. For imrpovement of the black position

1. strong counter-vailing ethnic community to fight majority prejudice (Piven and Cloward, 1967a)
2. increased black pride, black solidarity and black power (Piven and Cloward, 1967a)
3. separate ghetto organization and heightened awareness of distinctive goals (Piven and Cloward, 1967b)
4. integration should be understood not as the mingling of bodies but as participation in and shared control over major institutional spheres (Piven and Cloward, 1967b)
5. Negroes must increase social pride (Tidwell, 1967)
6. Negroes should be helped to develop identity separate from color (Tidwell, 1967)
7. greater integration (Simon, 1966

G. Miscellaneous recommendations

1. more services for the poor (Bernstein, 1967)
2. greater intervention in medical help funds, budgeting, home management, interpersonal relations, dependency problems and parent-child relationships (McCabe, 1966)

SECTION IV

SUMMATION

It is the purpose of this section of the report to attempt to establish a link between social work and education. This link will, hopefully, make it possible for education to take advantage of many of the insights and understandings that have been developed in its sister discipline. More particularly, it is hoped that the ideas generated in the consortium and discerned in the literature search will prove useful for designing a new, realistic and relevant program for training teachers of disadvantaged children. At the outset then, it seems appropriate to touch on some of the common, and uncommon ground held by the two disciplines.

Education - Social Work Similarities

Both education and social work are informed by the highest of unselfish motives. Both state their goals in terms of improvement of society and the enhancement of the individual. Both are service industries engaged not in the two-way negotiation and maneuver of economic exchange but in the one-way contribution of a service expertise. This is not to say that social workers and educators do not get gratification or reward from their activities--they undoubtedly do--but merely to point out that the recipients of the service are entitled to it by right and have no immediate obligation to tender anything in return. For this reason, both education and social work receive their support (largely) from the polis. The state, in its wisdom, has decreed that for their own good, its subjects should be educated. It has also declared that its educated subjects should not become dysfunctional within society. It has consequently set up institutions to combat the evils of ignorance and social maladjustment, and promote the virtues of education and social adaptability.

However, both education and social adaptability are variable quantities. One man's education is another's ignorance. One man's social responsibility is another's delinquency. For example, the minimum requirements for appointment to most universities is a Ph.D.--a mere M.A.

is not enough. Similarly, not every citizen meticulously observes traffic regulations, tax laws and injunctions against sexual promiscuity. Because this is the case, both education and social work have in common a retreating horizon. Whatever amount of education is provided, more could be done, and done better. Whatever social remediation is accomplished, more could be undertaken and achieved more efficiently.

One of the critical effects of the retreating horizon is that, for entirely understandable political and economic reasons, limits have to be set. The gross amount of education and social service that society permits is subjected to limitation. But, not only is the gross over-all amount restricted, the amount made available to specific individuals is restricted also. Society is thus faced with two continuing problems: (1) to decide how much education and social service to furnish in general, and (2) to decide the quota permitted to different individuals within the systems. It is at this point of course, that societal ideals run into life's harsh exigencies. The ideals of maximisation of individual potential and equality of opportunity pose practical problems. In both education and social work it is the <u>least</u> disadvantaged who produce greatest societal return for least effort. Under the system-conditions that obtain at present, it is the brighter, socially well adjusted child who can be educated more easily, for longer and with greater return on the capital invested in his education. By contrast, the duller, less well adjusted child produces a smaller dividend. It is fair to say that the greater the intellectual or social 'handicap' the more difficult and more expensive is the service necessary and as well, the less rewarding, in absolute terms, is the outcome. Of course, in <u>relative</u> terms the achievement, by both teacher and pupil may be immeasurably more impressive. For example, the nature of hearing and speech defects and their consequences are such that for a hearing defective child to even learn to speak, represents an achievement that more than compares with a normal child's graduation from elementary school. In a similar way, the more severely socially damaged a child is, the greater the investment of time, effort and money necessary to overcome his disadvantage, and consequently the greater the relative achievement when success ensues.

In one sense then, both social work and education inherit

frustration. Both know that more could be done to enhance the educational and social welfare of society. Both know that, more often than not, they do incomplete and inadequate jobs. Both know that their customers do not receive the best service and consequently do not come to realize (in both senses of the word) their own full potential. Consequently, both professions fall victim to formal and informal pressures (from both inside and outside their organisation) to subscribe to the idea of relative objectives. For example, given the pattern of history, it is realistic to predict that the majority of disadvantaged children will grow up in poverty, drop out of school prematurely, change jobs frequently, have first hand experience of anti-social behavior, remain economically deprived, be overly subjected to ill health and receive inadequate hospitalization and so on. The school, to be realistic, should both recognize the facts of disadvantaged life and be concerned about assuring survival in it. However, were it to do so, it would at the same time be giving tacit recognition to the improbability of the equality of opportunity ideal. Caught thus in a troubling dilemma, the present day school has tended to fall between the horns. On the one hand it has given lip service to the equality of opportunity myth but on the other it has declared the student raw material to be impossible to work with. Teachers, recognizing the improbability of their being able to overcome successfully both the causes and effects of economic disadvantage, have sought refuge in rationalisation. One of the terrible results of the rationalisation has been that teachers and taught have become victims of the self-fulfilling prophecy. The low expectations of the teachers are readily communicated to the pupils who, predictably, live up, or rather down to them.

To some extent, social work is visited by the same affliction. Where social workers are concerned with helping the socially malfunctioning individual to 'make-out', the definition of 'making-out' has to be environment relevant and therefore environmentally relative. For example, the problem of whether an unwed mother should keep her illegitimate child is seen, for guidance purposes, as the weighing up of consequential alternatives, for example, what are the likely economic effects of taking a certain decision, what provision can be made for

the care of the child, will it be possible to keep a job, etc., etc. Inevitably, these consequences are relative to that mother, her resources and her environment. If she and the environment are deprived then the rational solution to her problem permits a few alternates. If, on the other hand, she and her environment are privileged, more options are available. To such an extent then, social work too is caught up in establishing self-fulfilling prophecy boundaries beyond which it becomes increasingly difficult to go.

Education and social work also share a number of organisational features. Characteristically both are part of the public sector. Their support comes from government and their personnel are public servants. This places both sets of professionals in a peculiar relationship to the public they serve. The public hires them, fires them and in other ways exerts proprietory influences that are justified on the 'he who pays the piper, calls the tune' principal. At the same time the utility of the professionals to the public depends on the expertise--by definition, exclusive expertise--that the professionals have. So to this extent the public is ignorant of both education and social welfare--they are incapable of making rational judgements about the practice of education and social work. They are of course capable of having opinions and of exerting their political and economic power over both professions, but such a capacity for the exercise of power, is not to be confused with capability to make sound educational, or social work judgements. As a result of this state of affairs, both professions have the double problems of protecting their legitimately exclusive domain from public intrusion and of concurring to the legitimate demands of a concerned and affected public.

A further organisational characteristic held in common by social work and education is the hierarchical character of their administrative structure. Both are characteristically bureaucratic--bureaucratic in the Weberian sense of the term, not the everyday perjoritive sense. The organisational structure of social work is characterized by the division of labor, specification of rules and responsibilities, which in turn rest on the two administrative principles of coordination and specialisation. Because education is similarly placed, both professions have similar organisational problems. But whether their

respective adjustments to them are identical or not is something that will merit discussion later.

A third organisational characteristic that is common to the two, is the fact that both have university based training programs. The preparation of both social workers and teachers is subject to the influence of the organisational structure that is peculiar to universities. They therefore have in common problems of; institutional status; relationships with other disciplines; and reconciling their training functions with their educational function.

All this suggests that the migrant from education to social work or from social work to education would not find himself in completely foreign territory. Nonetheless the countryside is not identical. Consequently, some brief attention needs to be given to some of the more major discernable differences.

Social Work - Education Differences

In one sense social work is pathology oriented. Its principal concern is to remedy social illness. The illness may be manifested within indiviudals, within organisations, within institutions or within society itself. For this reason it is possible to find social work service agencies operating at all levels, providing consultative and guidance services to individuals rich or poor and to organisations large or small. It is probably fair to say that whatever social work agency exists, exists as a result of a perceived social ill. So whatever the service supplied may be, it exists to help remedy a problem--whether the problem is economic insecurity, vocational ignorance, psychological or psychiatric disturbance, delinquency, crime, ill health, or the like. What is more, the problem is an immediate one. This man is jobless now; this family is fatherless now; this child is before juvenile court now; this youngster is a dope addict now; this school has too many drop-outs now; this ex-patient of a psychiatric hospital needs continued support now--and so on, and so on. One consequence of this endemic state of affairs is that social work is essentially problem oriented. Its catch cry might well be "what's wrong". By contrast, education is not. True, each child poses a kind of problem in that his ultimate educational state is supposed to be better than

his initial one. But the problem, for the most part, is not pathological. Ignorance does not necessarily represent a pathological condition. This is because we have come to appreciate the developmental nature of the learning process. We can accept from a ten year old a performance that, were he four years older, we would judge to be ignorant. True we accept the idea of relative ignorance. Children who are not achieving at a rate considered consistent with their estimated capacity are seen as relatively ignorant. So are others whose performances fall appreciably below the norm for their age. And of course, provision is made in education systems for remedial work to be undertaken with such children. But the point that is being made here is that in education, such problems (pathological problems) constitute a much more limited part of the educational enterprise than they do of the social work one. The vast majority of social work problems verge towards the extreme that would be recognized in education as 'special'.

One consequence of such a state of affairs is that in social work the problem is much more clearly defined. If the issue is economic then its resolution will be in economic terms. If the issue is organisational, it will be resolved in organisational terms. If it is psychiatric, if it is social, if it is physical, it will be resolved in psychiatric, social and physical terms respectively. Furthermore, because the problem is defined and because it is immediate and because attempts at remediation are directed towards as quick a solution as possible, its success or failure is relatively apparent. As a consequence, it is (theoretically) possible for social work to modify its practice relatively quickly in the light of its results.* Contrast this with education where the goals of the enterprise are both diffuse and distant. For example, although the meaninglessness of the phrase "educating the whole child" has become recognized, the idea that education is concerned with the development of many facets of a child's capacity, is widely accepted. Also accepted is the idea that the immediate objectives, though important, are less important then the grander over-arching ones that lie in the distant future. It is more

* This is not to imply that the social worker's task is not complicated nor multi-faceted. The emphasis here is on the word 'relative'-- social work relative to education.

important for example, to equip a pupil to live a profitable and satisfying life as an adult than it is for him to master the concept of multiplication now. Furthermore, because the future is indefinite, and because education's objectives are somewhat ephemeral in contrast with the concrete and realistic character of social work objectives, this difference is not without significance. Also significant is the nature of the social worker-client relationship in contrast with the teacher-pupil relationship. Although it is part of the educational ethic to argue that the teacher is concerned with the uniqueness of the individuals that constitute her class, it is a demonstrable fact of educational life that characteristically teachers deal with pupils en masse (Jackson, 1968) (Adams & Biddle, 1979). They are, in fact, required to deal with collectivities rather than individuals. Now this is not a fact of social work life. Characteristically, the social worker deals with and focusses on one individual at a time--or on one group (a family, say) that shares the same problem. The social worker's task is highly individualized and highly personalized. What is more, the service offered is highly relevant--directed to the specific problems of the specific client at this specific time. Unlike the teacher, the social worker remains largely unconstrained by demands to fit all clients into the same regimen. The curriculum is not an ever present incubus.

By the same token, the evaluation of a social worker's performance can come to be seen in terms that are more relative than are those used in teacher evaluation. Success for the social worker is relative to the 'client', the place, the conditions and the time. Not so the teacher. Standardized tests, public examinations, institutional entrance requirements, all conspire to influence teacher evaluation so that it comes to be seen in terms of general, comparative success. The institutionalized pecking order among our educational institutions of higher learning testifies to the principal "getting there fastest with the mostest" not to the principal of "the distance you get with the load you carried". Predictably, teachers and administrators and education systems and the public come to adopt a similar stance. Thus the norm becomes not what is best for each child but, within the limited perspective of graduation success, how many can survive the system.

In the preceding section the point was made, rather briefly, that both teachers and social workers were, in effect, change agents. However, there are substantial differences in the way they fulfill the function. Teachers have, they contend, been charged with the task of preserving and perpetuating society's values. To this extent their role is conservative or perhaps more contemporaneously, conservational. They know what (behavioral) outcome is desirable and they are in the business of ensuring its advent. Their justification lies in the mandate given them by society to ensure the maintenance of the societal type. The social worker on the other hand tends to be somewhat pragmatic and expedient. Confronted as he is with a problem in social pathology his task is not to generate an ideal-type but to produce a remedy--the ill is to be cured, the discomfort and distress alleviated.

It is the individual case worker whose social work role most approximates the teacher's and therefore merits further consideration here. The way case workers have regarded their task has been subject to change in recent years. Where once, because they knew what would be best for their clients, social workers assidiously sought to manipulate them onto acquiescence, the contemporary social worker views his task differently. Basing his approach on assumptions which attribute both free will and responsibility to the client, and which respect individual autonomy and individual rights, he is concerned with helping the client to perceive the consequences of alternative forms of behavior. In a sense, his task is truly educational in that he helps provide information, insight and understanding that will enable the client to perform in a way more satisfactory to himself because the consequences of the action will be more gratifying. This approach, in contrast with the teacher's characteristic one, is much less directive. (It is however, not non-directive in the strictly Rogerian sense--for the exposure of cause and effect, antecedent and consequent feature prominently.) Because of the immediate and concrete nature of the social problem, it ofter follows that the practical solution does not necessarily represent the 'ideal' solution. Reality dictates its own terms, and its terms often deviate from the ideal. It is in this sense that the social worker is sensitive to expediency. The action that an individual client takes is not necessarily for the best in the best of

of all possible worlds--though it may be the nearest thing to best, given the harsh realities of that client's life space. To put it another way, the social worker has to be a social relativist. The solution most appropriate in each case is one that takes into account the relative condition of the client, the relative condition of his life space and sees both relative to the immediate present, the near future and perhaps even the distant future.

For the social worker to be both relativist and practical, requires him to have access to two kinds of information. First, he must know intimately and with empathetic understanding what the life-space conditions of his clients are like. Second, he must have knowledge of act and consequence in that life-space. These two kinds of knowledge are different in kind. The first requires a degree of affective involvement, of feeling and reaction that goes beyond the mere intellectual appreciation of the facts of the disadvantaged condition. The second requires an intellectual appreciation of (i) alternative forms of behavior possible under the circumstances, and (ii) the probability that anticipated consequences will follow. The social worker must know what the chances are. This latter information of course, has to have its basis in research. Necessarily it will also be expressed in terms of group norms.

Several points raised in the last two paragraphs invite interesting comparison with education. The education system also has a deterministic role in setting vocational limits for most of its clients, but it only grudgingly acknowledges this. Rather does it claim to provide opportunities from which the capable and energetic can, if they chose, profit. However, there is substantial evidence to show (see for example, the Coleman Report) that ability and energy is not necessarily enough. Environmental factors, including the school, influence the outcome extensively. The school thus inherits the double-bind problem referred to earlier. Should it realistically prepare a proportion of its clients for a future life of relative deprivation, or should it maintain the pretence that all can rise above it. A further problem arises directly out of this. Should the school also have regard for research based group data that can be used to predict future probabilities. In actual practice, it already does to some

extent. Counsellors and vocational guidance personnel operate with such a base. Characteristically they are concerned with 'special problems'. Also from time to time, the school takes into account intelligence measures and performance measures whose group based probability norms are then used to classify and diagnose individual competences. Two points need to be made about this. First, that while such norms are undoubtedly culturally influenced, cultural difference and cultural relativity are not taken into account in them. Second, there are hazards in using group based data in the diagnosis and prognosis of individual cases. Probability statements derived from group data, when applied to individuals become no more than an educated guess. What is more, it is an educated guess only in the sense that if enough individuals can be guessed about, then the incidence of success is likely to be greater than if the judgements were made at random.

All this is not very helpful in the solution of the school's problem of what to do about the proportion of its pupils who are likely to inherit a life of disadvantage. However, neither is the way in which the problem is being dealt with at the moment. It appears that in too many instances the school takes refuge in the claim that the pupils are incorrigible. The school's failure is thus excused on the grounds that the raw material was worthless in the first place. This is reflected in the attitude of administrators and teachers alike. Small wonder then that a proportion of the school population grows up unaware of the odds against them. They know neither the extent to which they have been victims of their educational and social circumstances nor have they been given anything useful to help them overcome. Instead they have heard the message of their own inferiority proclaimed loud and often. It is hardly surprising that they come to develop anger and resentment at the school, everything it stands for and the society that promotes it.

It is perhaps worth noting in passing that if it is true that the school rejects some of its clients as hopeless, then the question of the extent to which the education profession can merit recognition as a profession becomes pertinent. Doctors and lawyers cannot opt out of their responsibilities to their clients. Neither can social workers--

despite the fact that in comparison with teacher, the odds are often more heavily stacked against their achieving success.

Extrapolation: From Social Work to Education

The fact that social work and education have similarities and differences provides at the one time both a starting point for our utilization of social work insights and a circumscription of their utility. Because both professions have some similar purposes but dissimilar practices, it is possible to conjecture about the viability of the transfer of practices from one to another. But because they operate largely within different time constraints, it is reasonable to wonder to what extent extrapolation is legitimate. Also, because some aspects of education are relatively immutable--two times two equals four is not negotiable--and because much of social work is contingent, again the relationship has to be considered with caution. However, there is ample justification for undertaking the initial examination.

The Teaching Task

The most satisfactory place to begin is with the teacher of disadvantaged children. Typically she is concerned with a group of children who are diverse in capacity, in personality and perhaps on countless other scores also. Despite the fact that they share a condition of economic deprivation they are as uniquely individual as any other group of children in any other ordinary classroom throughout the United States. The suburban middle class has no monopoly on individuality. In fact there are grounds for arguing that the ghetto classroom is characterized by greater diversity than are those in homogeneous W.A.S.P. communities. Furthermore, given the predominance of middle class teachers in the service, there is distinct possibility that cultural differences between teacher and pupil are substantially greater than in typical suburbia. All this suggests two things--that the task of the inner city teacher is both different from and more difficult than that of her suburban sister.

The problems that follow from the diversity in the ghetto classroom and from the teacher's cultural remoteness, become crystallized at the point where communication is attempted. They become crystallized

because this is the point at which misunderstanding is confirmed or reduced. Now misunderstanding can conveniently be seen as a miss-match of expectations. In any given social situations, the participants have expectations about the kind of behavior they will meet and the kind of behavior expected of them. Characteristically too, they carry attitudes towards these behaviors--sometimes negative, sometimes positive. What occurs within the situation then can either confirm the expectations or violate them, and can reinforce the attitudes or change them. In the teaching situation, the teacher has a number of education based aspirations that she tries to turn into expectations that her pupils can perceive and can respond to appropriately. These in the ideal case are consistent with an educational philosophy formulated with the best interests of the children in mind. Overlaying these expectations however, are her own social attitudes developed during the process of her own socialization. These attitudes about, society about and about man effect her expectations and serve to modify those that are educational. In a similar but not identical way, the children in a ghetto classroom come with pre-established ideas about school, about teachers, and about classrooms. These result not necessarily from first-hand experience but from the meanings and norms and values that prevail in their immediate social environment. Like the teacher they have come to internalize the values of the culture they know.

Given the facts of ghetto life then, it is distinctly possible that there are many points at which pupils and teacher can violate each others expectations. Even at the initial point of contact when expectations about the role of the teacher and the roles appropriate for pupils are up for negotiation, the miss-match between expectations may be so great that no effective relations can be established at all.

It follows from the argument so far that if the effective teaching of children is contingent on compatibility of (positive) expectations, and that expectations are modifiable through communication, then two critical issues have to be faced. They are respectively; the nature of the expectations held and the meaning of communication assayed.

Teacher Expectations

It is of no point to examine here in detail the precise expectations teachers do hold about ghetto children, provided it is accepted that their expectations are not as realistic or as constructive as they might be. In other words, the problem can be defined here in terms of what the expectations should be, rather than what they should not be.

If teachers' expectations are to be functional, they have to be based on two sets of knowledge. In the first instance the teachers have to know what is intellectually and socially feasible for their pupils. And second, they have to know what is socially realistic for youngsters like these. In other words, they have to know what their youngsters are capable of doing and they have to know the social system constraints (school, university and society based) that will contain and restrain their achievement. Against such a realistic perspective they also have to put their professional optimism, that they as teachers can push their children up to and perhaps even beyond the limits set by a grim reality. Their job then is to blend optimism and realism--hope and circumspection.

What then does a teacher need in order to become reasonably proficient in conditions like these? The first and single-minded answer to this question is quite obvious--the teacher needs to be able to understand their ghetto children. But what constitutes understanding? It has been argued by black reformers that no one who is not black can understand what it is to be black. If this argument is carried to its logical conclusion then presumably no member of one culture can ever understand another. In the sense that no one individual's behavior can ever be entirely predicted by any other, such an argument has weight. But just as one would reject the conclusion that no individual could therefore help another, one must also reject the conclusion that cultural identity is a necessary condition for social service. The problem, if two cultures are to be reconciled, is to find ways of diminishing culture clash. For individuals, this can best be achieved by their coming to appreciate the nature and etiology of differences between the cultures and, more importantly, finding the differences acceptable. In effect, what is being called for is facility

in recognizing the meanings that life holds for others from a different culture and coming to recognize that the norms and values implicit in them are legitimate, and are in fact, equivalent to and no less valuable than ones own.

It is here that the experiences undergone by social workers can be drawn on. Obviously social workers are confronted with some of the most degenerate manifestations of the human condition. Obviously too, the manifestations invite a human reaction--dismay, disgust, pity, condescension, even hatred. Even more obviously, such reactions are dysfunctional--none would promote effective alleviation of the malaise. For survival, let alone success, social workers cannot hold their clients in comtempt--nor can they patronize them. The solution they have found to their very human problem is the professional one. The problem is seen to be not the person but the condition. What is permitted to appal is the illness, not the patient. Their professional ethos requires them to set their faces against the effects of deprivation, not the deprived. It would not be unfair to say that, in comparison with social workers, teachers too readily attribute their pupils' social and educational problems to the pupils or their parents. Children are tagged as lazy, uncooperative, inattentive, anti-social, maladjusted, disturbed, trouble-makers, and their parents are dismissed as indolent, wastrel, immoral, exploitive and so on, and so on. It should be quite apparent that such judgements are both personal and value laden. It is the (other) person who is evil and what is more, he is evil when measured against the judge's own criteria. The fact that the criteria are themselves culture biased and, for the judge, result from an accident of birth, goes undetected.

If the example of social work holds a moral for education then, the moral is that teachers must come to hate the condition of their disadvantaged children. Their task of remedying that condition is hindered immesurably if they do anything else. For the teacher then, what is the condition to hate. First of all, it is not the overt manifestations of poverty--shabby and dirty clothing, lack of cleanliness and the like. In so far as there are no remedial provisions in the school, these are no concern of hers. Neither are some of the

overt behavioral consequences of poverty. For example, hunger and lack of sleep have their own effects on pupil behavior. A pupil inattentive through hunger or fatigue is no more culpable than a pupil with epilepsy. In a similar way a pupil who manifests social behavior that he has learned through his out-of-school socialization is not culpable either. If for example, obscenity is a matter of everyday speech in the ghetto, the teacher should not find its occurrence in the classroom surprising. Neither should she attribute to others the emotional condition she herself experiences when confronted with obscenity. What may be intensely repugnant to her personally, may be of little consequence to others whose cultural norms do not employ the same negative sanctions.

If these are matters that should prove of little direct concern to the teacher, what are the issues that should be salient. Presumably the issue most central to her should be the educational state of her children. As the consortium recorded, she should hate the condition of ignorance with such intensity that everything else pales into insignificance.

While this represents a convenient starting point for the teacher of disadvantaged children, it obviously leaves a great many questions unresolved, for example; how does she come to feel this way; how does the feeling get translated into effective teaching behavior; what about the sheer problem of managing and administering the classroom; what about the organizational restraints that surround her, and so on. While it is not within the scope of this report to answer such questions in detail they cannot be ignored. For this reason a brief attempt will be made to indicate the direction in which one might go to begin the search.

Commitment against ignorance. Given the apparent fact that suburban middle class teachers have little difficulty in setting their faces against ignorance, one is forced to ask, why should this not also be the case in ghettos. It would seem reasonable to assume that the answer lies in the fact that in suburbia, both teachers and pupils share the same values. Because both teachers and parents have come to accept the utility of education and because their attitudes are couched in similar terms, predictably the pupils come to internalize

similar values. Apparently this is not the case in the ghetto. So the problem for the teacher becomes one of appreciating how differences in the ghetto environment come to influence the development of her pupils' educational values. Without that knowlege, any attempt she might make to try to induce change or to modify her own position would be no more than trial and error behavior. Consequently, her initial need is to know how the ghetto views education, what it thinks of the school, what it expects the school will do to and for its children. If some of the research reported in the earlier section of this report is true, this information would prove salutary. For example, it is apparent that disadvantaged groups value education. They see that education is necessary for vocational success. They want their children to receive education. They want that education to be of quality. And they want it to be relevant. At the same time, for reasons that are both clear and legitimate, they see the existing school as an alien institution, divorced from their community, representing unreal, remote and irrelevant, establishment values. Too often they see the teachers as agents of the establishment--also alien, also aloof, also unrealistic and also irrelevant.

At this point a small digression is necessary. In any situation where people have different values and different expectations, if conflict is to be avoided, there are only three logically alternative forms of behavior possible--one party can modify his position in favor of the others, the other can or both can. Characteristically in education, the demand for modification has tended to take one form only. The teacher demands that the children (or parents) modify <u>their</u> position. If they do not, then by definition the child becomes a failure and his association with the system terminates. For that child and that school the social system has broken down. Because of the increasing incidence of such break-down, counter demands are being made by parents. The voice of the community raised in protest is now being heard. Interestingly and ironically, the demands emanating from this quarter are often as intractable and inflexible as those that originally came from the school. Nonetheless, it is unreasonable to see either the school or the community as wholely and uniquely responsible for the educational ills that beset the ghetto school. Both

share the blaim and both together hold the means for making the best of both worlds. Both school and community in cooperation are likely to achieve more than they would separately and opposed. However, it is not organisations and institutions that cooperate, it is the people in them. Consequently we get back to the problem of making it possible for ghetto teachers to cooperate with their pupils and their parents.

At the simplest level the problem of cooperation can be resolved down to three basic components, viz:

(i) Do you understand how I see it.

(ii) Do I understand how you see it.

(iii) Now what appears to be a reasonable solution to our problem. It is true to say that at the moment the ghetto does not see education the way the school sees it, neither does the school see it the way the ghetto sees it. As a result, arriving at a solution is virtually impossible. To overcome this state of affairs the initiative should come from the school. If it comes from the community instead, it means that those who are inexpert in educating will be attempting to solve (difficult and complex) educational problems. They will perforce, be prompted by their feelings not by expert judgement. Predictably the solutions offered will be offered in desperation and hope rather than in assurance and wisdom. So if the initiative rests with the teachers then the problem becomes retranslated as the twin problem of;

(i) getting to understand how the others see it,

(ii) helping them to understand how I see it.

The two are interrelated and virtually require the teacher to be able to operate efficiently in another (ghetto) cultural context. To be able to do this, she needs exposure to this context in such a way that she can come to appreciate what it means to belong to such a culture. Necessarily she would have to come to have a functioning awareness of the problems attendant on living in ghettos--and the ingenuity displayed in overcoming them. After all, if one can marvel at the adaptability the ancient esquimaux or Australian aboriginals showed in their harsh forbidding environments, it should be equally possible to marvel at the ghetto dweller's adjustment to his.

The manner in which teachers become familiar with the meanings, values and norms of ghetto life cannot be elaborated here but it is

apparent that at least three different forms of exposure are likely to be useful. First of all, they should know the facts of ghetto living. To this extent they should become familiar with contemporary sociological and psychological research on ghetto society. It is here again that social work may be helpful. Social work, like education, is reliant on the perceptual and conceptual orientations of disciplines other than itself. However, social work succeeds in superimposing its own particular perspective on the knowledge it 'borrows'. A glance at much of the research reported in section II will indicate that the social work orientation calls for information on the <u>effects</u> of poverty. It is concerned with what happens to people who are placed in conditions that induce disadvantage. It is concerned with the condition of poverty as a manipulatable state of affairs. Neither sociology nor psychology are necessarily so manipulation oriented. (In fact, the incipient schism in sociology today derives from the belief among some sociologists that sociology should be concerned with the alleviation of social ills as well as researching them and intellectualizing about them.) A similar action orientation might well suit the new approach to ghetto education. However, to be self-consistent, the action focussed on should relate to education and the improvement of the <u>educational</u> lot of the disadvantaged.

From this action orientation grows the second requirement for teachers in training. Merely to have an academic understanding of the nature, problems and effects of ghetto life is quite insufficient. Closer involvement is necessary. Clearly not all the involvement can be direct, intense and full. In fact, for the most part, students will have to rest content with limited observations--one cannot live another's life time in a few short months. Under such circumstances the observation will have to be systematic and selective. It is not sufficient merely to put a student into a ghetto community or ghetto school and leave fortune to dictate what she will see or hear or come in contact with. This is too wasteful. Devices must be employed to ensure that her observational experiences are rich in scope and variety. They must, in other words, be diverse and comprehensive. This cannot be left to chance. As a result it will probably be necessary to supplement real life observations with recorded ones. Videotape and

audiotape records, movies, simulations and other means of documenting the actualities of ghetto life and education may have to be used. In this way some understanding of the complexity of the situation may be gained.

However, if such experiences are not to remain at the superficial level even more than this is necessary. Each student needs some intense involvement with some aspects of ghetto life. To this extent it seems propitious to provide for the students to spend time in one specific place dealing with one specific problem. It is doubtful whether the problem needs to be an educational one or not. If the purpose of the exercise is to get the trainee's full involvement, the problem could theoretically take any one of a number of forms. The desired result will be achieved through sustained exposure to the problem and all its consequential ramifications, not merely to the nature of the problem itself.

Integrating such a triumvirate of experiences into a teacher training program would pose its own logistic and organisational problems. In the best of all possible situations such experience should be timed to fit in with the rest of the program. The work in them should be systematic. There should be scope for discussion, examination and evaluation of the events involved. Hopefully, the whole process should be theoretically substantial. In other words, it should be the antithesis of the typically unsystematic, fortuitous, haphazard and intuitively evaluated experiences that are usually the lot of most teachers-in-training in their practice classrooms.

A training program designed in such a way should succeed in developing in students some considerable degree of understanding of what it means to live in the ghetto. If the program is planned and executed with sympathy for the student's initial ignorance and with sensitivity to feelings of those in the ghetto, the break-down of some of the old ghetto-school barriers could follow. However, a considerable amount of planning would necessarily have to be undertaken to ensure both outcomes. This would require educationists, sociologists and psychologists and social workers to confer on the problem. Even more essential would be the necessity for community resources to be tapped. It is at this point that what the community knows exclusively needs to

be related to what the experts know exclusively. From their mutual consultation could come the specifics of this part of the training program. The spelling out of such specifics, best expressed as behavioral objectives for the student, would require more time in the making than is available here. It would be the initial task for the next phase of program development.

Translating attitude into action. Assuming that all goes well with such a program in attitude development and that the students emerge sensitive to, and understanding of the ner city condition, what then? To plagiarize Bettleheim, "feeling is not enough". What mediates between human and human is not their internal conditions but the behavior they manifest. It is of no consequence what a person's intentions are if his actions are inconsistent with them. Just as a prejudiced score on an attitude scale is unimportant if the individual's behavior is unprejudiced, so it is unimportant if an individual's "heart is in the right place" if his actions belie it.

The training problem to be overcome then is the problem of ensuring that the trainees know how to translate their new insights into constructive behavior. There are two kinds of constructive behavior at stake--interpersonal conduct and educating conduct. Both will be dealt with in turn.

At rock bottom interpersonal behavior is, as we saw earlier, a communication issue. And this can be viewed in two ways--first, what form of communication is acceptable to him, second, what is it that I am communicating to him. There is, of course, more at stake here than just verbal language. Many aspects of our behavior communicate. Our clothes communicate, our posture communicates, where and how we look communicates, our hair style communicates, our intonation and pronunciation communicate, even the way we smell communicates. In any society there are acceptable and unacceptable features to be found in each of the facets listed above. Compounding the problem for the 'foreigner' also is the fact that there are expectations that surround the foreigner qua foreigner too. For example, it seems as if the use of non-standard Negro speech by whites in their dealings with black speakers of non-standard Negro English, hinders rather than helps the exchange. Now, for students to become adept at gaining the necessary

skill for the kind of diagnostic interpretive performance envisaged above, is a matter that obviously needs systematic examination and work too. Again the matter should not be left to chance or to the admonition of well intended practitioners whose sole basis for judgement is intuition. Once again it will be necessary for skilled researchers and educationists and community members to collaborate in a concentrated attack on the problem.

Any attempt at educating is predicated on an assumption that if A is done, B will result. However, one lesson that has resulted from research into teaching, is that certain qualifications have to be added to this original, rather simple formula. These qualifications concern; the teacher, the taught, the time and the place and the extent to which certainty about the result may be claimed. When all of these are taken into account the basic assumption has to be re-stated as:

> Given these children (this child) at this point in time, in this classroom, in this school, in this community, with the facilities I have available to me, and given too my peculiar strengths and weaknesses, if A is done there is some degree of probability that B will result.

The complexity of the problem is obvious but for the present discussion only a few points need to be made. No teacher can consistently make adequate decision about how to teach any class:

(i) without some awareness of the competencies and capacities of her pupils,

(ii) without some awareness of the system constraints (school and community) that surround herself and her pupils,

(iii) without some awareness of her own competencies and her own limitations,

(iv) without an appreciation of different resources (books, T.V., slides, programs, methods, etc.) that can constitute a repertoire from which she can draw to best meet the needs of her separate children,

(v) without an appreciation of the educational effects of her actions in that what is done today should relate to what was done yesterday and what will be done tomorrow.

Necessarily, understandings of this order are not relevant only

to teachers of disadvantaged children. They are in fact the staple of any teacher training program. However, in so far as they too need situational modification according to social context, the extent and manner of their applicability in ghettos must be understood. This peculiarly educational problem is almost as pressing in suburbia as it is in the ghetto. However, the ghetto situation has certain unique characteristics that should be touched on briefly here.

In the first place, many of the norms of behavior--cognitive and social--that have come to be acceptable to teachers in general, have been derived from settings other than ghetto ones. Intelligence tests have been 'validated' without regard for cultural difference--but they are used as if they are universally applicable. Again language performance is often evaluated in terms of one (middle class) standard while other achievement measures reflect the same sort of cultural bias. In a similar way, but less formally, the social behavior of pupils is characteristically evaluated against ideal-typical standards that are heavily weighted in favor of the middle class child. While such criteria are not without some utility, their indiscriminate and uninformed use militates against effective education. Regretably their application in non-orthodox settings leads to diagnoses that are incorrect and judgements that are irresponsible, unprofessional and often immoral. Judgements about language performance afford a good example. It is common for teachers, counsellors and psychologists to be struck by the fact that the language performance of black ghetto children differs from the language of equivalent aged non-ghetto children. They have often concluded from this that ghetto language is both inadequate and primitive in form. The first of these judgements is right, but only in so far as the ghetto child is being required by the (alien) school to conform to the language demands of the school. The second is manifestly wrong. Linguists have been able to demonstrate that non-standard Negro English (the language of many ghettos) is phonologically, semantically and syntactically sophisticated. It is in other words a legitimate, complicated language, entirely functional within its own social context. What this means is that while differences between ghetto languages can reasonably be identified, judgements about the superiority of one language over another cannot be

justified. That is, they cannot be justified in any absolute terms. It is true that one language is more functional in one setting than another--without French one is at a disadvantage in France. It is also true that some languages permit different kinds of cognitive processes than others. For example, the words and structures necessary for abstract reasoning are less well developed in some languages than others. However, the basic point of the functional relativity of language has seldom been appreciated in considering the problem of how best to teach language to ghetto children. Rather than seeing the relative utility of both languages--in their appropriate contexts--the school-approved language has been promoted as the only credit-worthy alternative. The resulting attitude towards non-school language has meant not only the denigration of that language but the denigration, by association, of those who speak it. This is not only socially indefensible but educationally indefensible too. Clearly, if the language internalized by the ghetto child is continually treated as aberrant and irrelevant, then the task of learning the other language becomes increasingly difficult. On the other hand, were the language teaching issue seen in the same kind of light that teaching English as a second language is seen so that similarities rather than differences were sought, then the task would be correspondingly easier.

There are two points that arise out of this discussion. Whether or not a teacher 'feels' sympathetic and supportive of her disadvantaged pupils, her successful teaching of them is contingent on: (i) her knowing how to take cultural difference into account--in other words, her not using irrelevant 'foreign' standards in judging her pupils, (ii) her knowing the educational consequences of the action she initiates. One is therefore constrained to ask, how does a training course provide teachers-to-be with this kind of ability? An elaborate answer is not possible--principally because the evidence that would justify one is not available. However, at this point in time it does seem reasonable to assert that the kind of in-the-community experiences discussed in the previous section would be relevant and useful. More is necessary beyond this however. In the first place, the student needs educating (rather than training) in the role that evaluation, judgement and assessment play in education. In particular she should recognize the

assumptions that are basic to all forms of educational judgements in general. Furthermore she should then become habituated to identifying the assumptions on which her own judgements rest and ensuring that they are consistent with her educational objectives. The other problem--knowing the consequences of her educating actions--is also a difficult one. It is probably true to say that teacher training has not been contingency oriented--at least as far as classroom practice is concerned. There is not available, at the moment, a considerable quantum of empirically based information that states the consequences of engaging in a variety of educating actions. Rather, has teacher training been intention oriented. Much effort and time and dedication has gone into ensuring that trainee teachers have the 'right' attitudes and values. These, appropriately idealistic as they are, have been regarded as worthy of all men to be believed. The consequent, homogenized character of teacher training is hardly surprising. Beyond this however, such an orientation has tended to take it for granted that if a trainee's heart is in the 'right place' then her actions will be correspondingly virtuous--and effective. It is now manifestly clear that there is no necessary carry-over from a belief system to the science of education. To think good thoughts is not a sufficient guarantee for effective action. Predictably then, educational research will become increasingly concerned with contingencies and with the effects of various attempts at behavior modification. There are two points arising from this that are particularly germane for the teacher of disadvantaged children. In the first place, a contingency orientation is a necessity. In the second, care should be taken to recognize the cultural bias that may lie behind empirically derived contingency evidence. One should not fall into the old intelligence and achievement testing trap again. For example, recent research based on reinforcement theory has shown that off-task (educationally irrelevant) behavior can be markedly reduced by increasing the number and frequency of rewards associated with on-task behavior (Hall, Lund and Raben, 1968). Whether this finding applies equally in ghettos and in suburbia is yet to be established. Also yet to be established are the kinds of rewards that reinforce in different cultures. It may be that the bullying, hectoring tactics often preferred by ghetto teacher are necessary.

Regretably, at the moment, no one knows. Because of our lack of information, it behoves the teacher of disadvantaged children--or any teacher for that matter--to look carefully at her own actions, constantly measuring them in relation to, not only her ideals, but the consequences as well. Such a strategy calls for a particular kind of teacher training that induces competency in both self observation and analysis, and class observation and analysis.

Classroom Management. If the preceding suggestions have been incorporated into a teacher training program so that the teacher of disadvantaged children is (i) more than superficially aware of what it means to live in a ghetto, (ii) has the ability to empathize with ghetto children, (iii) recognizes the destructive effects that irrelevant (and unprofessional) evaluation can have, and if she is also (iv) aware of the educational consequences of her own actions for her own children, she still needs other skills. She still, for instance, needs to be able to organize and manage her 'clients' so that her administration does not vitiate everything else. After all, if her capacity as an organiser is so inadequate that she can never put her educational expertise into effect, of what use is her expertise?
It follows then that the management task needs special consideration. There are certain first principles to start from. Some things are better done by pupils individually, some by pupils in small groups and some by pupils in large groups. Some things are better done with books, others with movies, others with tape-recorders, others directly by the teacher. Furthermore, the selection of the type of organisation and the medium of instruction calls for the recognition of the fact that pupils differ, so that what suits one may not suit all. It also calls for the recognition of the fact that the teacher is a variable too--capable of performing with different degrees of success, with different media and different pupils. The teacher's first task then is to diagnose the situation and thereafter to select the organisational form and teaching medium most likely to accommodate the many relevant and related variables best. It is obvious then that she needs skill in diagnosing the managerial 'needs' of her classroom. Beyond this she also needs skill in applying the remedy. If her diagnosis has been correct and if she has an array of managerial remedies to hand, the

success of her treatment depends on the extent to which she can persuade the patients to follow the regimen. Whether they will do so depends on the extent to which their cooperation can be gained. It is at this point we can make contact with social work again. Just as social workers are sensitive to the dynamics of the social groups with which they work, teachers need to become sensitive to the dynamics of their classroom social groups. They should recognize the mini-formal organisation they have on their hands. They should appreciate the influence of communication and social networks. They should appreciate how the formal and informal organisation structures can compete with or complement each other. Furthermore, if she is not to become a blatant manipulator of human beings, she needs to be able to ensure that the pupils too recognize the nature of this 'organisational game' so that their willing support can be assured. Once again it is not the purpose of this present report to go into greater detail on this matter--merely to indicate a needed direction.

The Teacher in the Organisation

Related to the previous discussion but writ larger, is the problem of the teacher as a member of a formal organisation, the school, herself. Like her pupils, she is a cog in a larger wheel. She is both critically important and, from a status point of view, insignificant. She is the worker. She is the one who carries out the educational task. But, for reasons that make administrative sense, she can exercise little power in the system. She is at the one time at the beck and call of the Superintendent, the Principal, the School Board, the Board of Education, her Union and probably the parents of her children. She is then both powerful and powerless. However, she is in a position where she can be abused by the power that others exert over her and can abuse what power she herself holds. Characteristically, there are two ways in which she may abuse her own power. First, she may seek relief from her own frustrations by taking vengeance on her pupils. Second, she may, in the company of her peers, attempt to use weight of numbers to exert political power against the community. Necessarily neither action is professional, though both are understandable because the conditions to which a ghetto teacher is constantly exposed, invite her abuse by others, so that the temptation to react and then over-react is great.

A professionally trained teacher would need to recognize the temptation and to appreciate the consequences of over-reaction. This is not to say that teachers should be acceptant when others unjustly exercise their power against the teacher. Far from it. They should; as well as being taught the effects of their own imprudent reaction, also be taught the ways in which prudent reaction would be productive.

The issue at state here is a survival issue. Teachers, if they are to survive in ghetto schools, need to be wise in the way of organisational procedure. They should know how bureaucracies work. They should know them so that they can more readily distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate organisational demands. They should know them so that they can effectively diagnose organisational malaise. They should know them so that if change is needed, they know how to go about inducing change effectively and without trauma.

The implication of such assertions for teacher training is that trainees need to be introduced to group dynamics and organisational study in such a way that they learn adaptability under different conditions of organisational life. By this means it may be possible for the 'they' of the administration and the 'us' of teachers to operate in each others mutual interest.

A special word needs to be said here about one of the points raised in the consortium. The speakers pointed out that the training process used for social workers institutionalizes the idea of individuality. Each trainer is seen as autonomous. How he (or she) goes about the business of training or educating her social work novitiates is a private business. Prescriptions and circumscriptions are noticeably absent. This, the speakers argued, was one of the means by which students come to see the social worker-client relationship as intensily individualistic. The role models displayed by the trainers themselves provided variety, differentiation and originality. Now, by contrast, schools of education demonstrate solidarity through similarity. It is probably true to say that even if College of Education professors are not required to perform according to one standard model, they tend to give the impression that they are. If this is so, then clearly their messages about the uniqueness of the pupil and regard for individuality are belied by their behaving.

There are grounds then for suggesting that, in any program of teacher training, attempts should be made to provide a variety of role models among the trainers themselves. Not only would this enhance the probability that individual students would then have a more extensive repertoire to draw on, but necessarily, tolerance of difference would be engendered too.

A further word also needs to be said under this heading on the topic of community involvement. It is patently apparent that ghetto communities, in reaction against their exclusion from the educational affairs of the nation, are clamouring to be heard. Predictably some of the clamour represents over-reaction. Community involvement has come to mean community control. The issue of political power has become confused with the issue of educational competency. Knowing they hurt, the deprived have demanded not only treatment but that they shall be their own doctors. As a result some communities have sought the right to exercise a voice in matters in which they have no competency. In a mixture of dismay, fear and guilt, school authorities have sometimes acceded--thus abrogating the expertise, training and knowledge of their own personnel. Two results follow. First, the community, now exercising a dominant voice in the affairs of the school, is free to make again many of the mistakes that were made earlier, in this and the last century. Second, the teachers, frustrated and insecure, are unable to either carry out their old role, or define a new appropriate one.

There is no opportunity to debate the pros and cons of community involvement here, however teachers in ghetto schools should be aware of the issues. Furthermore, they should be both knowledgeable about the situation and capable of clearly and effectively indicating their own position. They should have no difficulty in conceding to the community its rightful involvement. But they should be fierce in support of their own professional integrity. Necessarily, in going through the kinds of experiences that would produce this kind of educated circumspection and resolution, they would have to confront a number of issues that schools have characteristically ignored. For example, they would have to rationalise the extent of their legitimate interest. Very likely, their defined area of expertise will be seen to be far less than the

school has previously liked to admit. Placed in loco parentis, hitherto, the schools have often pre-empted and excluded the real parent. Furthermore, as the members of the social work consortium pointed out, if the teacher's task is to teach, then the decisions that are incidental to teaching need not be made by teachers. When the school is open, who uses it and for what, are not of themselves educational issues. In other words, if the school and the community exist for each other's mutual benefit, there are ways of arriving at a mutually beneficial rather than detrimental result.

Social Workers and Teachers. It is fitting at this point to consider the kind of relationship that does and could exist between the school and social work agencies. Both have need of each other's services but only rarely are both able to take full advantage of each other's skills. At the present time it seems as if the schools are inclined to sustain their position of remoteness. Isolated from the people, suffering from delusions of grandeur about the task assigned to them and their competency in doing it, they have tended to be megalomanial. Everything concerning this child is our preserve and we are capable of providing all that is needed. To this extent, they view the 'outside' social worker with suspicion, seldom offering help and even more rarely soliciting it. It is also obvious that the school, by its very alien irrelevance, makes work for the social worker. Some of his clients' problems are either school made problems or are problems that are susceptible to educational remediation. Obviously too, some of the school's problems result from action by social workers or commentary or criticism from them. Clearly such a state of affairs is reprehensible. But equally clearly, to remove it requires goodwill and intelligent appreciation of the problem by the members of both institutions. If teachers-to-be are to achieve such a degree of enlightenment, it will not come about by chance. Obviously the training program would need to make a deliberate attempt to provide for it. What this attempt should be would best be worked out by educational planners and social workers together. However, the following general points can be made here.

In the first place, there is no need for teacher trainees to become either intimately involved with the problems of social work or

extensively knowledgeable about them. They do however, need to know the sphere of operation within which social workers work. This means they should know about the kinds of task the social worker carries out, the way he operates, the principles that lie behind his performance and most importantly, the ways in which the social worker's job and his own are mutually dependent. He should as well, appreciate that the social worker can help him. He should therefore appreciate the advantages that will accrue from seeking his help and the way in which he can go about getting it. If he is to function efficiently under such circumstances, there is a certain amount of information he needs to have about the social services available in the community. Very often the teacher is the most socially sophisticated contact a ghetto family has. If the teacher can act as an informant about relief action that a troubled family can take, she can help ensure that disadvantage can be overcome.

With this kind of provision included in a teacher training program, it would seem that there would be scope for a student to be associated to some extent with social workers. If the teacher's training is to be community relevant and community involved, then relevance and involvement may be gained in this way. This suggests that the teacher of ghetto children should have an enlarged horizon. While her prime responsibility would continue to be over what happens in the classroom, the community relevance of what happens there would also be appreciated.

Discussion

In the preceding paragraphs suggestions have been offered about devising a course of training appropriate for teachers of disadvantaged children. The starting point for the suggestions was the social work consortium and the research reported in sections II and III. Necessarily, not all the suggestions owe their genesis to these sources. The reporter is an educationist. Necessarily his perspective is an educational one. Everything he views is seen through (distorted by) the educational lenses he wears. As a result, a number of liberties have been taken with the source material so that it has, from time to time, been used as a launching pad for an educational thought. It is hoped that such an approach has done no injustice to the social work

perspective.

Finally, it must be remembered that the express purpose of this exercise was to get to first base. What was required was an indication of whether or not it would be useful to establish links between social work and education and, if so, how to start to do it. This report has clearly indicated that it would be useful to establish contact. It has also suggested how this might begin to be done. The next step would require further and more direct collaboration between curriculum planners, social workers and the community. Their task would be to first subject this report to critical examination, and second to decide what would be worthy of undertaking. They would third, start to specify the behavioral objectives implicit in the undertaking. They would fourth, take the behavioral objectives to the social workers saying; this is what we want our students to be able to do, how can you help us arrive at the best way of doing it? Fifth, with the plan outlined, they would have to specify the equipment, organisation and experience detail that would provide the means whereby it would be carried out. At that point they would undertake sixth, a pilot study critically examining and evaluating each component. When adjustments had been made and evaluated, then and only then would the full scale program be ready for mounting.

Such an approach though somewhat time-consuming, would have the benefit of being systematic and rational. It would, in other words, be consistent with the kind of approach that has characterized American science and technology--and this, it seems to us, is worthy of emulation in the social sciences.

Bibliography

(References not found elsewhere in the Report)

Adams, Raymond S. & Biddle, Bruce J. Realities of Teaching: Explorations with Video Tape. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

Bettleheim, Bruno. Love is Not Enough: The Treatment of Emotionally Disturbed Children. New York, The Free Press, 1950.

Coleman, James S, et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Hall, R. Vance; Lund, Diane & Rabon, Deloris Jackson. 'Effects of Teacher Attention on Study Behavior' in Gelfand, Donna M. Social Learning in Childhood: Readings in Theory and Application, Belmont, California, Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1969.

Jackson,P.W. Life in Classrooms, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.